B L
805
A9
MAIN

UC-NRLF
$B 109 663

The University of Chicago
FOUNDED BY JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER

THE DEIFICATION OF ABSTRACT IDEAS IN ROMAN LITERATURE AND INSCRIPTIONS

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND LITERATURE IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

(DEPARTMENT OF LATIN)

BY

HAROLD L. AXTELL

LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY
OF
CALIFORNIA

CHICAGO
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
1907

The University of Chicago
FOUNDED BY JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER

THE DEIFICATION OF ABSTRACT IDEAS IN ROMAN LITERATURE AND INSCRIPTIONS

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND LITERATURE IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

(DEPARTMENT OF LATIN)

BY
HAROLD L. AXTELL

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CHICAGO
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
1907

A9

Copyright 1907 By
The University of Chicago

Published September 1907

Composed and Printed By
The University of Chicago Press
Chicago, Illinois, U. S. A.

TO MY MOTHER
IN GRATEFUL APPRECIATION
OF HER
SYMPATHY AND ENCOURAGEMENT

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/deificationofabs00axterich

PREFACE

In the following treatise the writer has had two objects, in pursuance of which the treatise falls into two parts. In Part I an attempt is made to classify the certain and probable deified abstractions besides those in doubt, and to set forth the most important facts about them. In this I have not aimed at an exhaustive or encyclopaedic treatment, or to serve the purpose already accomplished by the various dictionaries and manuals upon Roman religion. The main facts of each cult are briefly set forth and, for these, ancient and modern sources have been freely used; but the chief aim has been to discuss at length obscure and disputed points. For this reason more space has often been given to uncertain, though less prominent, examples than to well-known cults.

In Part II, I have intended to give a general survey of the origin and position of these deities as a class among the Romans. The evidence of coins and plastic art has not been used, except incidentally in a few cases, since a thoroughgoing investigation in these branches would have been too extensive for the present work.

It is to a study of Professor G. Wissowa's *Religion und Kultus der Römer* that the inception of this *opusculum* is due, as also its guidance in many respects. I am also greatly indebted to Professor Gordon J. Laing, of the University of Chicago, under whose constant supervision my work has been carried on. Professors F. F. Abbott, W. G. Hale, Paul Shorey, and Edward Capps, and Mr. B. L. Ullman have also given me valuable help and advice.

HAROLD L. AXTELL

UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO
June, 1907

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum (*CIL.*).
Ephemeris epigraphica (*Eph. epig.*).
L'année épigraphique (*L'ann. épig.*).
Notizie degli Scavi (*Notizie*).
Orelli-Henzen, *Inscriptiones latinae* (Orelli).
Dessau, *Inscriptiones latinae selectae* (Dessau).
Boissieu, *Inscriptions antiques de Lyon.*
Ruggiero, *Dizionario epigrafico.*
Babelon, *Monnaies consulaires* (Babelon).
Cohen, *Médailles impériales.*
Eckhel, *Doctrina numorum veterum* (*DNU*).
Roscher, *Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie* (Roscher).
Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertums-Wissenschaft.*
Daremberg et Saglio, *Dictionnaire des antiquités.*
Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung* (*Röm. S.V.*).
Preller, *Römische Mythologie* (Preller).
Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer* (*R.-K.*).
Wissowa, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen* (*Gesam. Abhandl.*).
Domaszewski, *Die Religion des römischen Heeres.*
Carter, *De deorum romanorum cognominibus.*
Engelhard, *De personificationibus, quae in poesi atque arte romanorum inveniuntur.*
Aust, *De aedibus sacris populi romani conditis.*
Henzen, *Acta fratrum Arvalium.*
Gilbert, *Geschichte und Topographie der Stadt Rom im Altertum.*

CONTENTS

		PAGE
PART I.	THE DEIFIED ABSTRACTS AS INDIVIDUAL CULTS	7
I.	State-Cults	9
	A. Of the Republican Period	9
	B. Of the Empire	31
II.	Abstracts Popularly But Not Officially Worshiped	43
III.	Occasional and Individual Deifications	48
IV.	Doubtful Examples	50
PART II.	THE DEIFIED ABSTRACTS AS A CLASS	59
I.	Their Origin	59
II.	The Deified Abstracts in Literature	67
	A. Literature of the Republic	69
	B. Literature of the Early Empire	76
	C. Literature of the First and Second Centuries A. D.	79
	D. Literature of the Late Empire	83
	E. The Christian Fathers	85
III.	The Abstracts in the Inscriptions	86
INDICES		99
I.	Index of Deities	99
II.	Index of Authors	100

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

PART I. THE DEIFIED ABSTRACTS AS INDIVIDUAL CULTS

The cases of deification to be considered in this paper may be grouped merely for convenience according to Cicero's classification, *De nat. deor.* ii. 19. 28 (cf. Wissowa *Religion und Kultus der Römer* [*R.-K.*], p. 271), as (1) virtues, *virtutes,* and (2) desirable conditions, *res expetendae.* The latter class will be interpreted rather broadly to include such material concepts as connote a quality or condition; e. g., *Annona,* "abundance," and *Pecunia,* "wealth." On the other hand, an abstract idea specialized in a purely material way as *Tranquillitas,* "sea-calm," is practically as concrete as any natural object deified, e. g., *Nympha,* and is therefore excluded. In some cases the distinction is not easy to make, but in these cases considerations of general usage and relationship have been the determining factor in the selection.

It is more difficult to define deification; for, apart from all metaphysical speculation as to the essence of deity, into which it is not my purpose to enter, it is impossible to set a sharp limit between personification and deification, so closely related are the two provinces. To personify is to give personality to an object or power; to deify is to ascribe superhuman attributes. Given the principle that certain qualities are actually deities, every quality is a potential god, and the circle is limited only by the number of abstractions which the mind is capable of making. And the circle is not the same for every mind. Qualities so rare and so important to one man as to seem sacred spirits at work in the universe are to another but mere notions. Many, therefore, of the qualities which we find embodied in personality in imaginative literature may have seemed to their authors true deities and not merely rhetorical figures; but, as there is no way of definitely determining this fact, they must be disregarded. We must rely, therefore, on external evidences of worship, which in order of importance may be classified somewhat as follows: first, temples, priests, and festivals; second, shrines, and altars; third, the use of the word sacrum in formulae and of the word deus or dea; fourth, statues, reliefs, and figures on coins.

Temples, priests, and public festivals in Rome are evidence of

state-cults. Altars[1] and shrines are in themselves signs only of private or perhaps popular worship; for many religious cults were allowed perfect liberty privately, in so far as they did not become centers of political activity or degrade the morals (cf. Wissowa *R.-K.*, p. 408).

The term sacer implies worship (Marc. iii. 3. 2), but in poetry, like deus and dea, it became weakened by rhetorical use to mean anything revered and cherished as rare; cf. the English "divine." Even in inscriptions it came to be used with pure appellatives, as in memoriae cuiusdam sacrum, and once it is found in an honorary inscription to a person; viz., III. 398, M. Aimilio M. f. Pal. Proculo praef. fabr. M. Lepidi Aug. . . . . procos. sacrum Civitas Pergamen. h(onoris) causa. This too is upon an altar.[2] Cf. VI. 27455, Sacrum M. Titieno M. f. Martiali; also VI. 24815.

Statues, reliefs, and figures with legends upon coins do not of themselves afford sufficient proof of a cult. They are only the artistic expression of mental concepts, embodied personifications revered, but not necessarily deified. Stripped of the ever-present cornucopia, helmet, scepter, veil, or wreath, they are the same female figure (cf. Wissowa *R.-K.*, p. 9), and even with these symbols it is not seldom impossible to distinguish between them (cf. R. Engelhard *De personificationibus*, pp. 56–64). The extent to which mere qualities are symbolic on coins is seen in the dedication Alacritati on a coin of Gallien (Cohen II, no. 54). For others see Wissowa *R.-K.*, p. 280. It is questionable whether a thorough study of the figures and their symbols, as this scholar suggests, would determine what were the true deities, since the caprice of an artist is as great as the rhetorical personification of a poet. Both care little for actual facts of cult. This kind of evidence would

[1] It has been held that in some cases altars imply no true worship, but are simply commemorative; e. g., Tac. *Ann.* i. 14, aram adoptionis; iii. 18, ultioni; iv. 74, clementiae (see Furneaux and Nipperdei ad loc.); Cic. *Phil.* 14. 34; Suet. *Aug.* 1; *CIL.* IX. 3079, 3837; VI. 3474, 3611; *Thes. ling. Lat.*, p. 388; Ruggiero *Diz. epig.*, p. 594. The passage from Cicero implies figurative worship, that from Suetonius is doubtful in text and meaning. The altars with inscriptions upon them are in honor of some person, but they may well have been used at the same time for the worship of some deity also. For Tacitus see below, p. 80. These few exceptions, if valid, are insufficient to throw any material doubt upon the use of an altar for worship in any other case.

[2] The representations, however, of a palm and an oak tree with serpents near by may possibly indicate real worship of the *genius*.

transcend the limits of the present paper, and, like rhetorical personification, it is used here only in connection with more certain proofs of worship.

In accordance with these various kinds of evidence, the deified abstractions fall naturally into three classes:

I. State-cults.
II. Popular but unofficial cults.
III. Occasional and individual deifications.

I. STATE-CULTS

A. OF THE REPUBLICAN PERIOD

In chronological order, as far as they can be determined, these are:

FORTUNA, or, by her earlier and fuller designation, FORS FORTUNA.—Varro *L.L.* v. 64 names Fors as separate from Fortuna, and other writers use this name, but it is not found in the actual cult. According to tradition, Servius Tullius (Ancus Marcius, Plut. *De fort. Rom.* 5) founded two temples—one at the first mile-stone on the Via Portuensis, the other in the Forum Boarium. The location of these temples outside the Pomerium and the traditional designation of Servius Tullius as their founder indicate that Fortuna was not a native Roman deity, but that she was adopted very early, probably from neighboring Italic communities, e. g., the Sabines (Praeneste, Varro loc. cit.), the Latins (Antium), the Etruscans (Ferentinum), or the Umbrians (Fanum Fortunae). See Peter in Roscher I. 1548.

Most probably she was a beneficent power of good luck in the earliest stage. This conception of her function is supported by her worship among those of humble state in the temple of Servius Tullius, by the mythical stories of her association with that fortunate youth, by her various services to women, and by the fact that she was sung and honored by farmers after successful harvest (Ovid *Fasti* vi. 771, 569; iv. 375; Columella x. 311). The evidence is much too incomplete to determine which of these various phases was the earlier. Marquardt (*Röm. S.V.* III, p. 578) supported by Wissowa (*R.-K.*, p. 206), seems to hold that originally she was a goddess of agriculture and horticulture. They cite Columella x. 311. But that passage is far too incidental, as Peter (Roscher I. 1502 f.) has seen; and even if it is granted that the farmers worshiped her (and it

was natural that they should), this by no means implies that they alone worshiped her. For how can we derive her functions as a goddess of women from an agricultural starting-point? The late farm-calendars (*CIL.* I², p. 280) adduced by Wissowa afford no help, for they name sacrifices to deities not restricted in origin to agricultural relations; e. g., Mercury, Hercules, Spes, Salus. They simply pick out important sacrifices for the various months. The situation of the temples in the country would be more significant evidence did we not know of Fortuna Muliebris ad IV miliarium in via Latina. Finally, the absence of Fortuna, in the list of ancient agricultural gods in Varro *De re rust.* i. 1. 6, is strange if she had been originally revered as a goddess of the farm alone.

From a spirit of good fortune she became, in a later conception, one of chance (incerti casus, Cic. *De nat. deor.* ii. 11. 28), and this shift in conception, due possibly to the Greek idea of Fortuna caeca et exoculata (Apul. vii. 2), led to designations bona and mala (Plaut. *Aul.* 100; *Rud.* 501), so that under the latter epithet an altar was erected on the Esquiliae (Cic. op. cit. iii. 25. 63). This Greek influence is seen also in the cult of Fortuna Iovis puer Primigenia, the first-born daughter of Jupiter, with its system of lots at Praeneste, which cult was not introduced into Rome until 194 B. C., when after the siege of Crotona the consul built a temple to Fortuna publica populi Romani Quiritium, on the Quirinal, followed by others in the same locality and on the Capitoline.

Numerous other cults of various names sprang up, representing functions and relations which were in many cases very minute, so that in these specializations she became of no more distinct individuality than a *genius;* cf. Fortuna huius loci (*CIL.* III. 10399); Fortunab (us) Verulanae (VI. 182); per Fortunas (vestras) vestrosque Genios, (Apul. viii. 20), and Peter in Roscher I. 1521 ff. As a special protector of private homes she was frequently included among the Penates (Helbig *Wandgemälde,* pp. 73 ff.).

The emperors, beginning with Augustus, gave great prominence to Fortuna Redux, honoring her with an altar and annual games on the anniversary of the return of Augustus from the East in 19 B. C. She was brought into relation with the cult of the emperors by the cognomen Augusta. Recognizing Fortuna as the supreme deity in crises, the state officials placed images of the Fortunae Antiates on the throne of Jupiter during Poppaea's confinement in

63 A. D. (Tac. *Ann.* xv. 23). Antoninus Pius had the golden image of Fortuna in his sleeping-room, and transferred it to that of Marcus Aurelius as the sign of his succession (Julius Capitolinus iii. 12. 5, 6). It is not strange that many considered her *dearum praecipua* (Fronto, p. 8, Naber).

The Roman armies of the Empire gave an important place to the goddess of chance. Domaszewski (*Religion des römischen Heeres,* p. 40) suggests that Vespasian was the first to introduce the cult, as previously it was contrary to Roman spirit to emphasize the importance of chance in the army, which intended to master its power. But that the connection between Mars and Fortuna was seen at least in republican times is proved by the companion dedications to Mars and Fortuna *de praidad* (XIV. 2577, 2578). The juxtaposition of Fortuna with Hercules in the inscriptions of the equites singulares (VI. 31140, 31145, 31148–49; cf. also IX. 4674) may point to some inner relationship between these cults, possibly derived in some way from the myth that Hercules gave the horn of Amalthea to her (Porph. ad Hor. *Carm.* i. 17. 14; cf. Wissowa *Gesam. Abhandl.,* p. 303, who also shows that no German deity was concealed in the name Fortuna in these inscriptions).

CONCORDIA.—The goddess of harmony had her first temple on the east slope of the Capitoline above the Forum, built in 367 B. C. by the dictator Camillus to commemorate the reconciliation of plebeians and patricians after the passage of the Licinian laws. Of the origin of this cult we know nothing besides these facts. But Preller (II [3], p. 260) and Peter (in Roscher I. 915) consider Concordia originally a secondary designation ("Nebenform") for Venus, derived perhaps from Venus Cloacina, who, they say, had a shrine in the vicinity of the temple of Concordia. This hypothesis, however, is not justified by the extant evidence, which is (1) a coin of Mussidius Longus, bearing the figure of a building inscribed cloacin(a) on the reverse side, the obverse showing the face of Concordia; (2) a resemblance of Concordia on two coins of the gens Vinicia to Venus Victrix. But Venus Cloacina is only a guess by Pliny (*N. H.* xv. 119) to explain a deity that had long since lost its original signification to everybody, in the same way as Venus Murcia and Venus Libitina had lost theirs (cf. Pauly-Wissowa *Encycl.* IV. 60 f.). As for the resemblance to Venus Victrix (Peter), it is not sufficiently marked to be convincing.

Venus Victrix has a diadem and other forms that Concordia lacks. Venus Erycina (Babelon *Monnaies consulaires* I, p. 379) seems more like her, and Fides (Babelon II, pp. 127 and 136) has a similar expression. The ornaments of laurel, earring, and necklace are not decisive, for they are found on other deities (cf. the necklace of Anna Perenna). This evidence, therefore, is far too slight to give any degree of probability to Preller's identification. There would be as good reason to connect her with Juno from the African inscription (VIII. 4197, Iunoni Concordiae Aug.), in which the combination evidently signifies the marriage state, and Concordia is doubtless appositive. But from this juxtaposition we cannot infer any orginal identity of the two. So far as we know, Concordia was always an independent conception.

Besides the temple near the Forum, there was another on the *arx* in 216 B. C., erected to commemorate the suppression of a military revolt in Gaul (Liv. xxii. 33. 7). Again after the civil war in 44 B. C. the Senate established the cult of Concordia Nova, and in 10 B. C. Augustus founded a sanctuary for her in conjunction with Salus and Pax. Later the cult typified, besides political concord, the cordial relations in the emperor's family; e. g., between Tiberius and Livia (*CIL.* X. 810; Ovid *Fasti* vi. 637), Nero and Agrippina (VI. 2041, l. 31, Concordiae honoris Agrippinae), Vitellius and Galeria (VI. 2051. ii, l. 13). Vitellius was fawningly called Concordia by the senators and took the name as a cognomen (Suet. *Vitel.* 15). Statius (*Silv.* i. 2. 239, 240) speaks of our goddess in the aspect of marriage. Still later the reference is to the relations between the emperors and their heirs: Concordia Augustorum (*CIL.* VIII. 17829), Augusta[3] (ibid.; cf. VIII. 8301, and Hübner *Annali* 1864, p. 263). The importance of this state-cult is strikingly attested by the fact that in Patavium a special organization of Concordiales existed, inferior in rank, but connected with the Augustales (*CIL.* V. p. 268, nos. 2307, 2843, 2865, 2869, 2872).

But, outside the sphere of a state-cult, Concordia was also

[3] The phrases Concordia Augusti (*CIL.* VIII. 18891. ii. 465) and Concordia ipsius (VI, p. 479) are difficult to understand; for the harmony of one person is impossible. Mommsen (ad VIII. 18891) assumes two statues each set up to the Concordia, or harmonious spirit, of one of the two rules. Hübner (ad II. 465) connects this phrase with the reading Concordia p(opuli) R(omani) on coins, and conjectures that it refers to the cordial relations of Augustus with the Roman people.

frequently honored throughout the Empire. I will mention a few interesting cases. In Africa a statue of Concordia Perpetua was set up by a city subject to a neighboring colony, but having its own commonwealth (VIII. 15447; cf. also VIII. 6942). In Sicily the Lilybaean state erected a temple of Concordia Agrigentinorum for the neighboring state of Agrigentum, possibly recalling their interference and restoration of peace in the affairs of their neighbors or the harmonious attitude of the latter toward themselves (X. 7192). In Thamugudis, Africa, the inhabitants, having constructed a forum with their own hands and means, at the order of the authorities (ordo) erected pedestals to Concordia populi et ordinis (VIII. 2342). The armies apparently did not commonly worship this deity, but we find a temple (?) erected to Concordia var(iarum) stationum in connection with the Genius b(ene)ficiariorum (XIII. 6127; *Eph. Epig.* IV, pp. 383, 400; Domaszewski op. cit., p. 107).

Salus.—In Salus we have another ancient Italic divinity attested by archaic inscriptions from Praeneste, Pisaurum, and Horta; viz., Salutes pocolom (I. 49), Salute (I. 179). In some unknown way the Sabines assumed a relation between her and Sancus, as the name Salus Semonia indicates (see references in Wissowa *R.-K.*, p. 122). She was given a temple on the Quirinal in 302 B. C. (Varro *L. L.* v. 52; Liv. x. 1. 9: dedication day August 5, *Fasti Amiterni;* Cic. *Pro Sestio* 131) as the goddess of welfare, in which sense Plautus refers exclusively to her, while Terence sometimes couples her with Aesculapius (e. g., *Hecyra* 338). This is due to the fact that just after Plautus' time, in 180 B. C., she was identified with Hygieia, the wife of Aesculapius (Liv. xl. 37. 1–3). But the more general conception of the earlier period endured along with this new narrow specialization (e. g., Ter. *Adelp.* 761; cf. Cic. *In Verr.* iii. 131; *Pro. Font.* 21; *Ad Att.* xii. 45. 3) down into the empire (V. 428, Saluti Augustae pro incolumitate Piquenti; XIII. 1589, Saluti generis humani).

This deified abstract is one of the most important in the list, at least in the Empire. The frequent prayers to her alone and conjointly with the Capitoline trinity which are preserved in the records of the Arval Brothers show this. It is not certain, however, that in these she is always the donor of welfare, as Wissowa holds. In the prayer in behalf of the good health of Nero, the probable heir to the throne (50–54 A. D., VI, no. 2034), Jupiter, Juno,

Minerva, and Salus are the deities invoked; but the formula, instead of being abbreviated by a reference to the same words used above to Jupiter, as is the case with the prayers to Juno and Minerva, and usually with those to Salus (cf. *CIL.* VI[1], p. 466, l. 13; p. 510, l. 20; p. 514, l. 4; p. 524, l. 17, and elsewhere), is repeated in full as follows: [Sa]lus publica populi Romani Q[uiritium te quaesumus precam]urque uti tu Neronem . . . . salvom incolumemque con[serves et in reliquom malae v]aletudinis primo quoque [tempore praestes expertem . . . .]. The reason for this unusual repetition lies apparently in the conscious recognition that Salus was the special patron of health. Moreover, as Aesculapius and Hygieia-Salus were of Greek origin, and the Greek religion did not prescribe a male sacrifice to a male deity and a female to a female as the Roman did (Wissowa *R.-K.*, p. 137), the exceptional sacrifice in *CIL.* VI. 2037 = VI. 32352, Saluti eius b(ovem) m(arem), if the copy is correct, may have been due to a confusion of the Roman goddess with the Greek.

On March 30 Salus populi Romani was worshiped together with Janus, Concordia (above, p. 12), and Pax. In the farm-calendars she is mentioned with Spes and Diana as divinities to receive sacrifices in August, and she was doubtless a household goddess (cf. her name on a gem (XI. 6712[390].), and on a clay vessel (II. 6257[171].), but it is surprising that we have no private inscription to her in Rome. Like Victoria and Fortuna, she is often very closely coupled with the great gods (III. 10109; *L'ann épig.* 1899. 7), and she seems to have had a temple with the Capitoline trio in Lambaesis (VIII. 2648) and with Roma in Pergamum (III. 399). She was worshiped throughout the Empire (cf. Claudian *Carm. Min.* 30. 188), with temples at Venusia (IX. 427), Ariminum (XI. 361), Capera (II. 806), and with other cults in Lugdunum (XIII. 1782), Pompeii (*Notizie* 1891, p. 265), and Britain (VII. 100). If we may judge from the mention of a flaminica in Urbs Salvia near Ancona and the probable derivation of that city's name, apparently Salus was the patron deity of that city. It is somewhat surprising that the regular Roman armies did not honor her (Domaszewski op. cit., p. 43), although she was a favorite deity of the equites singulares (see Fortuna above, p. 11).

We may also mention in this connection Hygieia, who came into Rome as part of the cult of Aesculapius in 293 B. C., and existed

long after she was officially identified with, and absorbed by, Salus in 180 B. C. Thus in 153 A. D. we find a lex collegi Aesculapi et Hygiae (*sic*) in Rome (VI. 10234), but it is noticeable that here, and in nearly all the inscriptions where the Greek form occurs, the worshipers are Greek (e. g., X. 1546, 1571; XI. 2092; VI. 17, 18, 19; IX. 5823). Rarely is the goddess mentioned apart from Aesculapius (Orelli 1582; XI. 4128, 5025). In the temple of Aesculapius and Salus in Lambaesis were altars to Aesculapius and Hygieia.

Valetudo, or Bona Valetudo, is a variant and translation of Hygieia, apparently used to distinguish the Hygieia-Salus from the native Salus of general welfare. So on the denarius of M. Acilius Glabrio (54 B. C.) appears the head of Salus on the one side with the name Salutis, and the figure of Hygieia on the other with the title Valetu(do). Also in a bilingual inscription from the Asclepieion of Athens (III. 7279) Valetudo stands as the equivalent of Ὑγιείη. Much more ancient, however (third century B. C.?), is the inscription from Lecce in southern Italy (IX. 3812): V. Vetius Sa. f. Valetudne d. d. l. m. See also IX. 3813: Annius Vecus Valetudne donum dat. In Africa at Auzia a public temple was dedicated in 235 A. D. to our deity with the full name Bona Valetudo (VIII. 20747); cf. VIII. 9610 at Manliana in the same region: Bonae Valetudini sacrum ex responso Herculis L. Pesc(ius) Honoratus sac(erdos) d. d. d. p. CCXXII.

Victoria.—The first known temple to Victoria was founded August 1, 294 B. C., upon the Palatine (Liv. x. 33. 9; xxix. 14. 14). It was on the clivus Victoriae, but its exact position is uncertain. This and the adjoining chapel of Victoria Virgo, founded in 193, are the only seats of this cult in Rome of which we hear. The early history of the goddess has been much disputed recently. Formerly it was commonly held that she was a very ancient divinity, going back in origin to Vica Pota, with whom she was confused (Asconius, p. 13). Her equivalent was seen in the Sabine goddess Vacuna (Preller I, pp. 408 ff.; II, p. 244, n. 3; cf. Wissowa, p. 44, n. 3). Recently, however, Wissowa (*R.-K.*, pp. 127 f.), upon evidence at first sight very significant, has advanced the theory that this cult was an offshoot from that of Jupiter Victor. He calls attention to the facts that (1) in the records of the sacrifices of the Arvales to the gods in behalf of the ruling house we find, following the Capitoline trinity, at one time Jupiter Victor, at

another Victoria, and in one case (VI. 2086, l. 27) the two are coupled in a pair thus: Iovi Victori b(ovem) m(arem) a(uratum) et Victoriae b(ovem) f(eminam) a(uratam); (2) the temple of Victoria on the Palatine was built a year after that of Jupiter Victor on the Quirinal(?).[4]

These facts, shrewdly noted and ingeniously fitted together, are certainly indicative of a close connection between the said cults; nevertheless, I do not believe they are sufficient to establish the genesis of Victoria from Jupiter. For, in the first place, the Arval Brothers, wishing to make their list complete and inclusive of deities presiding over all phases of the emperor's life, would think in some cases of Jupiter Victor as the helper toward victory, at other times would cover that idea by naming Victoria herself. Naturally Jupiter Victor would be named oftener than the other gods with the same cognomen, e. g., Mars, Hercules, or Venus, because of his supreme importance and greater prestige.

As to the coupling of the two deities by the word et in VI. 2086, l. 27 (213 A. D.), this is done for the purpose of filling out and dwelling on the idea of victory, much in the same way as in the reign of Trajan prayers were uttered to Iovis Victor, Mars Victor, Victoria, and Hercules Victor, the chief gods of victory (VI. 2074). And if a more significant meaning be seen in this use of et, and it be granted that the Arvals saw in Victoria a feminine counterpart to the great god of victory, it by no means follows that such a conception of the third century A. D. was general or was held in the early republic when the cult began. Of course, Jupiter Victor would often be coupled with Victoria, oftener possibly than any other god; but the other deities were also, to some extent. In fact, a very good theoretical case for Mars Victor as the original starting-point might be made out from the facts (1) that Victoria follows directly upon Mars Pater and Mars Victor in the above-named inscription, while Iovis Victor has preceded and is separated by Salus from this group; (2) that Mars and Victoria are very frequently joined in inscriptions—e. g., VII. 220; III. 1098, 5790, 5897, 5898; XIII. 6593. In Raetia (III. 14370) the two divinities had a common temple.

The second point rests on the supposed inner connection between

[4] Gilbert (*Rom in Alterthum* III, p. 428) saw a connection between the two cults, on the supposition that this latter temple was on the Palatine.

the founding of the temples of Jupiter Victor and of Victoria in successive years. But that this is more than a coincidence is by no means sure. At all events, the natalis of the latter was on the Kalends and not the Ides, which is the date sacred to Jupiter Victor; and since the location of this cult is uncertain, the argument from space relations is entirely lacking.

On the whole, therefore, this theory is not convincing, and it is much simpler to consider our goddess an independent deification of a very early date. The notion of victory is quite as important and general as that of the sky or of war. To the early Romans engaged in struggles against their hostile neighbors it was an all-important and common conception, and to me it seems quite as probable that they thought of a special spirit granting them success in war as that they thought of it as coming from their sky-god. From the general notion of victory, any god might be looked upon as assisting toward it, and thus we find Jupiter (Iovis), Mars, Hercules, Venus, Diana, Fortuna, Minerva, and Lar with the cognomen victor or victrix respectively. (Cf. Carter *De deorum romanorum cognominibus* under "victor;" A. Baudrillart *Divinités de la Victoire,* p. 84.)

Furthermore, ancient evidence points to this deification as a native Italic cult. The Sabines worshiped her under the name Vacuna, if we may trust Varro (Acro. ad Hor. *Epp.* i. 10. 49), who probably is corroborated by the inscription of Vespasian (XIV. 3485).[5] Victoria was also honored in Latium, if we may trust the word Vitoria (a dialectal peculiarity or a mistake for Victoria) on a mirror (I. 58) and on a cestus (Baudrillart, pp. 48 f.), and among the Marsi (*CIL.* I. 183, 184). Finally, Dionysius Halicarnassus (I. 32) states that there was an ancient altar in her honor upon the Palatine.

In the face, therefore, first of the belief of the ancient Romans

[5] See Baudrillart op. cit., pp. 32 ff. I agree in the main with the author's conclusions, though nothing certain can be proved as to the identity of this temple with the ancient shrine of Vacuna. An analogue, however, may be cited for the replacing of the old name Vacuna by the new Victoria in the substitution of Salus for Hygieia in prayers by order of the authorities in charge of the Sibylline books in 180 B. C. (Liv. xl. 37. 2); also in the fluctuation between the designations Aesculapius et Hygia and Aesculapius et Salus on the temple and altars in Lambaesis (VIII. 2579a, 2589, 2590).

and their antiquarian Varro, and of the evidence from inscriptions, which point toward cults of Victoria among Sabines, Marsians, and Latins; second, of the general recognition of a spirit of victory in Vica Pota going back perhaps to 509 B.C., it is not safe to establish a theory of origin based on a fancied relation whose main support is a single inscription of the late empire. Mommsen's identification with Vitula, "Exultation," is due to an error of Macrobius (*Sat.* iii. 2. 11).

Victoria was apparently never worshiped outside the sphere of military conquest. As was noticed above, her name was very frequently joined with that of Mars, especially in Gaul and the eastern provinces where they had temples together (III. 14370[9], XIII. 6593; cf. III. 1098, 5790, 5897, 5898). Fortuna is another common associate (XIV. 4002; VI. 2314; cf. Baudrillart, pp. 87 f., for other examples of her cult). Among the dii militares she stood next in rank to Jupiter and Mars. But the armies specialized the notion to represent either the victorious might of the Imperator (with reference often to a particular victory) or the power of the troops. This specialization is strikingly illustrated by an inscription from Tunis, Africa (Cagnat. *L'ann épig.* 1895, no. 71): Pro salute et victoriis Imp. Caes. . . . . Gordiani Pii Felicis Aug. . . . . cum statuis Victoriarum tribus . . . . aedificavit et dedicavit. . . . . Here the emperor has a temple to his several Victories, each having her own statue. There is nothing but pure flattery of the emperor, and it is not the goddess who was honored, but the victories themselves were exalted as divine.[6]

Spes.—During the First Punic War, in 258 B. C., a temple was erected to Spes in the Forum Holitorium, whose natalis was August 1 (Fasti Vallenses, *CIL.* I, p. 320), but it is quite probable that this deification was made much earlier than this date. For the name Spes Vetus, known throughout Roman history, referred to a district near the Porta Labicana, and was probably given to an older sanctuary of Spes to distinguish it from the later more prominent public temple. There is, however, little warrant, as Wissowa (*R.-K.*, pp. 273 f.) has shown, for assuming with Preller (II, p. 253) that she was an agricultural deity connected with Venus, the Italic goddess of the garden. While Tibullus in i. 1. 9 prays that she may not

[6] Victoria, cited as a deity in Index, *L'ann. épig.* 1903, no. 107, is, of course, only a woman's name, as is shown by the epitaph accompanying it.

fail the farmer, but give him heaps of grain,[7] in ii. 6. 20–28 he generalizes her functions, viz.:

> Spes favet et fore cras semper ait melius
> Spes alit agricolas, Spes sulcis credit aratis
> semina, quae magno fenore reddat ager;
> haec laqueo volucres, haec captat arundine pisces
> cum tenues hamos abdidit ante cibus:
> Spes etiam valida solatur compede vinctum
> (crura sonant ferro, sed canit inter opus);
> Spes facilem Nemesim spondet mihi sed negat illa.
> Ei mihi, ne vincas, dura puella, deam.

In Plautus (e. g., *Cist.* 670, Spes sancta), where we meet first in literature with this goddess, the meaning is always general in the several passages referring to her (*Bacch.* 893; *Pseud.* 709; *Merc.* 867; *Rud.* 231, 275), and in later literature there is no trace of this assumed original specification. The figures with the pomegranate bud or flower[8] are merely symbolical like the cornucopia, and probably go back to the representation of the Greek Ἔλπις; cf. Elpis and Nemesis on a marble vase in Rome, the former holding a branch in the left hand and a pomegranate flower in the thumb and first finger of the right (Roscher, see Elpis). Macrobius (i. 21, 24) represents Iustitia (Virgo) holding a wheat-ear in her hand.

As a deity dear to mankind her full name is Bona Spes, found on a seal, a brass ring at Rome, and an amphora (XI. 6705[20]; IX. 6080). She had temples in Ostia (XIV. 375[32].), an altar at Aricia (XIV. 2158), and statues mentioned as gifts to Fortuna

[7] It would be as valid to suppose that Pax was originally a garden deity from Tibullus i. 10. 45:

> At nobis Pax alma veni spicamque teneto
> perfluat et pomis candidus ante sinus

especially as Ovid (*Fasti* i. 104) says:

> pax Cererem nutrit, pacis alumna Ceres.

[8] It is difficult to explain the meaning of this symbol. Possibly in the bud and the opening flower there is hope of a perfect future. At any rate, the fact that Indulgentia also carries a flower in the same position on coins of Alexander Severus (Cohen[2] IV, no. 65) shows that the symbolic content was lost and this symbol came to be merely conventional. In the same way Concordia was given the olive branch without reference to any material sphere. On the other hand, there may be some support for Preller's view in a dedication to Fortuna, Spes, and Venus (VI. 15594), where, besides, a globe, pole, wheel, and crown with Cupids and a dove, attributes of Fortuna and Venus, we find a bough laden with apples.

(XIV. 2853, 2867). With the latter she is often connected. Horace (*Carm.* i. 35. 21) places her with Fides in the retinue of Fortuna, and in Capua these three have a cult in close conjunction (X. 3775). But whereas she is contrasted favorably with Fortuna in an epigram, Fortuna innocentem saepe, numquam Bona Spes deserit (Ribbeck *Appendix Sententiarum* II, l. 255), sepulchral inscriptions often mock her; e. g. XI. 6433, Spes et Fortuna, valete, nil mihi vobiscum est: alias deludite quaeso.

By the emperors she was worshiped with special regard to the youth, the "hope" of the house, after Augustus established a special supplicatio to her and Iuventas on the anniversary of his assumption of the toga virilis (October 18). Only once, however, was she brought into the prayers of the Arval Brothers (VI[1], 2043, l. 10). For other references to Spes Augusta see Wissowa op. cit.

Fides.—The conception of good-faith was made sacred in the dim antiquity of the Roman state, although the first temple of which we hear was founded on the Capitol in 254 or 250 B. C. Tradition ascribed this deification to Numa or the Sabines (Plut. *Numa* 16; Dion. Hal. ii. 75; Varro *L.L.* v. 74), and the antiquity of this goddess was designated by the epithet cana; cf. Verg. *Aen.* i. 292, Cana Fides et Vesta, Remo cum fratre Quirinus Iura dabunt. Better evidence, however, is her relation with the ritual of the ancient flamens (Livy i. 24. 1).

The idea of faith and fidelity had a close association with Jupiter from the earliest times, and with the title Dius Fidius the great god of the heavens was worshiped in a temple on the Quirinal founded 466 B. C. It is the usually accepted theory that Fides was an offshoot of this cult (Preller I, p. 251; Wissowa, pp. 48, 123 f.), on the following evidence: (1) The fact, above mentioned, that the three flamens of Jupiter, Mars, and Quirinus rode annually to the temple of Fides on the Capitol, and, with their right hands covered to the tips by white bands, offered sacrifice. The function of the Flamen Dialis shows that he was in early times connected with the worship of Fides. (2) The proximity of the temple of Fides to that of Jupiter Optimus Maximus. This is assured by Cato's remark, quoted by Cicero (*De off.* iii. 29): qui iusiurandum violat, is Fidem violat, quam in Capitolio vicinam Iovis O. M., ut in Catonis oratione est, maiores nostri voluerunt. (3) The cult of Dius (Diovis) Fidius on the Quirinal.

These facts certainly indicate a close connection of "faith" with the supreme god of Olympus, which the Romans themselves recognized. Whether it means more than this—i. e., an actual genesis—cannot be demonstrated. For, without taking up the general question of such evidence as (2) and (3), which will be discussed later (p. 65), one or two objections present themselves. Why, if the annual sacrifice were a relic of a rite peculiar to Jupiter, did the other flamens take part? Is it not as simple to believe, with Livy (whether Numa instituted the ceremony or not is immaterial), that it was a rite intended to show that faith was a basic principle of the state, that Fides therefore took front rank as a state-cult, and that they bound themselves to good-faith? Cf. Aulus Gellius xx. 1. 39: sed omnium (virtutum) maxime atque praecipue fidem colunt sanctamque habuit tam privatim quam publice. On the other hand, the most positive evidence of all is lacking, viz., the coincidence of dedication days. The date of Fides, the Kalends of October, is not the same as that of Dius Fidius, the Nones of June, nor a day sacred to Jupiter.

The full name of the goddess was Fides publica populi Romani Quiritium and had reference to the strict maintenance of a pledge which was the meaning of the symbolic ritual; cf. also Catullus xxx. 11 f. However, only one inscription from the republican period is extant, on a third-century cippus from Picenum. In the empire the customary cognomen Augusta was given her also (IX. 5422, 5845) and the phase of her cult emphasized was that of loyalty to the emperor. One curious inscription (X. 5903) possibly refers to conjugal fidelity. Another (IX. 60), on the tomb of a trader which alludes to his anxiety concerning trade and expenses, regards her apparently as the patroness of commercial credit, as follows:

> Alma Fides, tibi ago grates, sanctissima diva;
> fortuna infracta ter me fessum recreasti;
> tu digna es, quam mortales optent sibi cuncti.

Though represented as a military deity on coins (Fides legionum, etc.), she is not found among the cults of the army.[9]

Honos.—This deity was rarely honored outside the sphere of

[9] One veteran, however, dedicates an offering to her (III. 14342[1]). Inscriptions are rare, although the cult lasted probably as late as Arcadius, Honorius, and Theodosius (*Notizie* 1880, p. 53).

war.[10] His temple was vowed in the war with the Ligurians, 233 B. C., and soon afterward was dedicated. In 205 M. Claudius Marcellus built a temple of Virtus in close connection with it, so that these two cults became virtually one, and dedications to Honos alone are rare. (Examples are V. 5892, 5869, 4449; XII. 1815, III. 5123. The usual order is Honos et Virtus, but the reverse occurs in III. 3307.) Marius built upon some hillside another temple of beautiful symmetry, but without marble (Vitr. *praef.* 17), and Pompey built a sanctuary for these deities at the same time with those for Felicitas and Venus Victrix.

The origin of the cult is unknown, but the story of Cicero (*De legg.* ii. 58) regarding the discovery of the lamina inscribed Honoris near the Porta Collina and the removal of graves to make room for a temple there probably goes far back, since in this vicinity an ancient inscription was found reading: M. Bicoleio V. l. Honore donom dedet merito.

As a military deity, Honos was individualized with reference to the legion, and also very curiously to its eagle: e. g., XIII. 6690: Genium legioni (*sic*) XXII Pr. P. F. Honori aquilae leg. s. s. (?) Aurelius . . . . ; also XIII. 6708, 6752; cf. Domaszewski op. cit., pp. 41 f. Probably Honos did not occupy a prominent place in the religion of the emperors. He is mentioned only once in the prayers of the Arval Brothers (*CIL.* VI. 2044, l. 5; 66 A. D.), when a cow was sacrificed to him. If we are not to think of an error in the record, Wissowa's brilliant suggestion of Greek influence in this cult is quite plausible (*R.-K.*, p. 137). For an analogous case see Salus, above. Moreover, we find no use of the cognomen Augustus except on a coin of Antoninus (Coh. II, no. 449). At Terracina there were games given to him (X. 8260), and at Narbo a special collegium was devoted to him (XII. 4371).

Ops.—Although without a sanctuary until probably the third century (293–218 B. C.), and worshiped only in the Regia by the Vestal Virgins, Ops is the oldest of the abstracts, and perhaps the only one native to the ancient Romans; for her name is preserved in the calendars of ancient festivals in the terms Opalia and Opiconsiva. This latter name and the by-name Ops Consiva identify her closely with Consus, as Wissowa (*R.-K.*, p. 168, and Roscher

[10] See, however, *CIL.* V. 4449, 7468; XI. 3147; III. 7599, for political allusions; V. 5892, for commercial. Orelli 1815, cited by Wissowa in Roscher, is called spurious by Henzen.

III. 932) has shown, the connection with Saturn having been derived from the false identification of Saturn with Cronos, and of Ops as a Roman deity of the earth with Rhea or Terra, the wife of Cronos. Varro (*L. L.* v. 64) considers her of Sabine origin, brought into Rome by Titus Tatius.

The temple on the Capitoline is not mentioned till 186 B. C. (Aust. *De aedibus,* no. 56). Another cult, Ops Opifera in the Forum (?), was established between 123 and 114 B. C. (Plin. *N. H.* xi. 174; *Fasti Amit.,* December 19). As the early cult referred especially to the abundance of the crops, it is possible that the latter was thought of particularly as a goddess of assistance. The word ops has this meaning as early as Ennius (fragment in Vahlen 126; cf. Cic. *Tusc. disp.* iii. 19. 44), and this is the only meaning of opifer found in literature and inscriptions; e. g.: Ennius (ed. Vahlen, p. 109), fidem opiferam socium advocaret; Ovid. *Met.* xv. 653, cum deus Aesculapius in somnis opifer consistere visus; Orelli 1753, Fortunae Opiferae pro salute; etc. The sacrifice mentioned in the calendar of the Arvales (*CIL.* I², p. 326, August 23) to Ops Opifera, Volcanus, Iuturna, the nymphs, and Quirinus, would under this theory have been performed to secure help in case of fire.[11] Outside of Rome only a temple at Praeneste is known (XIV. 3007), and but few inscriptions are extant. The use of Ops in literature has been fully and accurately treated by Wissowa in Roscher III. 935 ff.

LIBERTAS.—Much difference of opinion has arisen regarding the external facts of this cult. There are allusions to temples of Libertas, of Jupiter Libertas, and of Jupiter Liber on the Aventine (Liv. xxiv. 16. 19; *Mon. Ancyr.* 4. 6; *Fast. Arval.,* September 1). Jordan (*Eph. Epig.* I, p. 237) and Aust (op. cit. v. Jupiter Libertas) apparently took the first two names to refer to the same cult. Wissowa (Roscher III. 2032, *R.-K.,* p. 126) made the two latter equivalent, but rightly asserted a separate temple for Libertas built before 238 B. C. by a certain Gracchus. Following Preller (I, p. 195; II, pp. 252 f.), he derives Libertas from Jupiter Libertas, whom all the above-named scholars consider one deity (cf. Aust. in Roscher II. 663 f.[12])—a conclusion supported by two similar inscriptions found outside Rome (XIV. 2579; XI. 658).

[11] The phrase Opi divinae (IX. 2633), seems also to mean "divine help," but is suspicious (Roscher III. 935).

[12] Becker (*Handb. der röm. Altert.,* p. 721), Babelon (op. cit. I, p. 473), and

On this theory, the intermediate stage in the differentiation is found in Jupiter Liber, whose function of creative power became subordinated to that of freedom. (Cf. *CIL.* III. 14203[2], where Greek slaves set up a statue of this god to record their manumission.) As a god of freedom, then, he was sometimes called Jupiter Libertas, from whom Libertas became independent, and her relation to the parent-deity was preserved by the fact that her natalis was on the Ides (cf. Wissowa *R.-K.* loc. cit., and Carter op. cit., p. 13).

The fundamental idea of Libertas was apparently personal liberty, as we may infer from the fact that a painting of the battle in which the slaves secured their manumission was placed in the temple in 238 B. C. (Liv. ibid.). During the régime of Caesar the cult stood for political liberty, freedom from despotism, and in this sense Brutus and Cassius exalted the goddess. Similarly, in the Empire, after the death of despotic rulers like Nero and Domitian, she was exalted and given the cognomen Augusta (II. 2035; also V. 326, Genio Lib. Aug. may perhaps be filled out as Genio Libertatis Augustae).[13]

MENS.—Mens had a cult upon the Capitol founded 215 B. C. natalis June 8, as the giver of intelligence (August. *De civ. dei* iv. 21; Tertul. *Ad nat.* ii. 15), which quality the Romans deified after their disastrous mistake at Trasimenus. The seat of her cult in southern Italy (Paestum), and the dedication of the cult in Rome in conjunction with that of Venus Erycina, a Sicilian goddess, point to Greek origin; but the assumption by Preller that Mens was practically a cognomen of Venus Erycina is not warranted. (Cf. Wissowa *R.-K.*, p. 260, with whom I agree in toto). Although Mens is loosely used sometimes for animus, "disposition," in literature and in the inscriptions (e. g., XIII. 2313; VIII. 16463), yet we have no evidence for understanding, with Preller, the special sense of a "loyal disposition" in the worship by the guilds of slaves and freedmen (I. 1156; X. 472, 4636, 1550).

Blanchet (in Daremberg and Saglio III, p. 1199) hold that two distinct deities were joined in one cult. It is certainly difficult to explain on the hypothesis of one cult the coin of the Egnatian gens, which almost surely represents Jupiter and Libertas standing on the porch of a distyle temple.

[13] Mommsen ad loc. is mistaken in holding this impossible on the ground that Iunoni would be required; cf. Genio Pacis (VIII. 17832), Genio Victoriae (II. 2407), etc.

Cicero (*De legg.* ii. 19. 31; *De nat. deor.* ii. 61; ii. 79; iii. 88) evidently regarded this cult with great honor, and frequently cited it as a typical deified abstraction worthy of true worship. The cognomen Salus seems to have been given to Mens in the following public inscription from Tibur (XIV. 3564: Menti Bonae Saluti Q. Caecilius Q. l. Philadelphus, P. Aquillius P. l. Donus mag. quinq. ex pec. conl. f. c. idemque signum dedicarunt). But see below, p. 97.

VIRTUS.—As a state deity, Virtus was not a goddess of virtue in general, but of courage in battle. Our first official notice concerning her couples her with Honos, with whose temple Marcellus joined one for her (Liv. xxvii. 5. 7; xxix. 11. 3; see Honos above). We have also, however, some records of her as an independent deity. In 134 B. C. P. Scipio Africanus Minor erected an altar to commemorate the capture of Numantia. While we hear of no separate temple in Rome, we have inscriptional evidence of a saltuarius Virtutis in Ferrara (*CIL.* V. 2383), a collegium in Nepet (XI. 3205), and a priest in Mauretania (VIII. 9026, 9027), which imply temples.

Few inscriptions to Virtus Augusta are extant. Among them are VII. 397; VIII. 16528; II. 1062; VII. 1135, the last-named of which is quite interesting. It is upon a bas-relief from Britain referring to legio II victrix pia fidelis, and represents Mars Victor, winged Victories, and Virtus, the latter bearing a vexillum inscribed Virt(uti) Aug(ustae). (Cf. Domaszewski, p. 41; *Eph. epig.* III. 100.) We also find her specialized with reference to some particular emperor; e. g., VIII. 7095, statua[14] aerea Virtutis domini n(ostri Antonini); *L'ann. épig.* 1894, no. 136, Virtuti invicti Imp.

Since Virtus and Bellona were both goddesses of war, they were frequently thought of together. Bellona was called the escort or attendant of Virtus, deae pedisequae Virtutis Bellonae (*Rev. arch.* XXXII [1898], p. 465 = *L'ann. épig.* 1898, no. 61). In another example Bellona is the cognomen of Virtus in the fusion of the two conceptions, viz., In h. d. d. d. deae Virtuti Bellon(a)e[15]

[14] Statues of Virtus mentioned here and in XIV. 69 were probably of the helmeted Amazon type seen on coins as early as M. Aquillius (101 B. C.; see Engelhard op. cit., p. 60).

[15] The fact that here Bellona, as Dessau 3805 points out, is probably the Ma-Bellona of Cappadocia, matters little upon this point.

montem Vaticanum vetustate conlabsum (*sic*) restituerunt civitatis Mattiacorum, etc. Whether in V. 6507 Virtuti Bellonae one or two deities are mentioned is uncertain; at any rate, Virtus is more prominent. Victoria too is called Virtutis comes (VIII. 18240).

As in the monuments, so in literature, Virtus usually is "Valor" (Cic. *De nat. deor.* ii. 61. 79; iii. 88; *De legg.* ii. 19. 28; and especially, *Phil.* xiv. 35). The Culex (294 ff.) represents Venus and Virtus honoring the marriage made by Peleus and Telamon. Statius calls her "cruenta" (*Silv.* i. 662). See also Flor. i. 2; Apoll. Sidon ii. 502; Amm. Marc. xiv. 6. 3; and Sil. Ital. v. 126; xv. 18, in which latter passage Virtus debates against Voluptas before the younger Scipio.

But the wider meaning of worth or virtue is seen in a few cases; e. g., feminine virtue in Ovid *Ars. amat.* iii. 23. Pliny (xxxv. 70) describes a painting by Parrhasius in which are represented Philiscus, a comic poet, Liber, a Thracian nurse, and Virtus, who from the connection must represent excellence in composition of comedy. Here, then, Pliny translated the Greek Ἀρετή. St. Augustine (op. cit. iv. 20, 21, 24) conceived of Virtus as Worth or Virtue, and said that Virtus and Felicitas could have comprised sufficiently all the ideas worshiped by the Romans. Possibly Virtus in Horace *Carm. saec.* 58 stood for virtue.

IUVENTAS.—Iuventas, later Iuventus, did not receive a separate shrine till 191, but the deity was known long before this in connection with the great temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, in which she had an aedicula in the vestibule of the cella of Minerva (Plin. *N. H.* xxxv. 108). This fact, with two others—viz., that every youth who assumed the toga virilis brought an offering to Jupiter Optimus Maximus, and that two inscriptions (IX. 5574; XI. 3245) read Iovi Iuventuti (they, however, were found outside of Rome and belong to the imperial period)—points to an early inner relation between the cults.

Later, under the influence of Greek mythology, the Roman deity was identified with Hebe, a goddess of a similar sphere, but personified as the cup-bearer of Zeus and wife of Hercules—an identification maintained throughout Latin literature (Cic. *Tusc. disp.* i. 65; *De nat. deor.* i. 112; Hor. *Carm.* i. 30. 8). To her in this rôle a supplication was made in 218 (Liv. xxi. 62–69) at the temple of Hercules, and a new temple was dedicated near the Circus Maximus by C. Licinius Lucullus in 191 (Liv. xxxvi. 36. 7). The cult seems

to have continued in the charge of the Luculli, for in 60 the annual ludi on January 1 were omitted on account of the domestic trouble of M. Lucullus (see Cic. *Ad Att.* i. 18. 3, and Boot's note). Cicero says: eius (*sc.* anni) initium eius modi fuit ut anniversaria sacra Iuventatis non committerentur; nam M. Luculli uxorem Memmius suis sacris initiavit; but Wissowa (Roscher II. 765) uses this passage with reference to the cult on the Capitoline. If he is right, the anniversaria sacra must have been a different festival from the ludi Iuventatis vowed by Salinator, which took place in connection with the temple near the Circus. Boot's conception of the ludi and the anniversaria as identical seems far more probable.[16] If it is correct, it follows that the natalis of the temple was January 1, which is supported very slightly by the fact that Livy recounts the supplicatio of 218 among events occurring in the winter (ea hieme, xxi. 62. 1). It is not unlikely that the dedication of the temple and the coincident festival were made in accordance with custom on the day of the previous lectisternium. At all events, I think the anniversaria sacra, a term synonymous with natalis, must be referred to the temple at the Circus Maximus, or there is no point to Cicero's jest. The natalis, therefore, was probably January 1.

At Vienna in Gaul the cults of Iuventas and Mars probably stood in close connection, the former having intimate relations with the iuvenes as the fighting force. It enjoyed great prestige, for many of its flamens were men of high official rank in the municipality (cf. *CIL.* XII. 2613, 1869, 1870, and p. 219). It may also have been closely associated with the cult of Iuventus Augusta with special regard to the assumption of the toga virilis by Augustus (X. 8375), as Wissowa (op. cit., p. 126 and Roscher II. 766) thinks, but it is surprising that the cognomen is lacking in all the inscriptions pertaining to this cult, although the dedicators were imperial officials.

Pollentia.—Livy (xxxix. 7. 8) narrates that in the ludi Romani of the year 187 B. C. a mast fell in the Circus Maximus and knocked down the statue of Pollentia, in place of which two others were set up in accordance with a *senatus consultum*—the one gilded, the other the restored original (?). Very likely Plautus alludes to

[16] So Gilbert (op. cit. III. 93) and Hild (in Daremberg and Saglio, see Iuventas) take it, without, however, seeing the connection that Boot makes. Preller (I, p. 261, no. 3) unaccountably refers the ludi to the cult on the Capitol.

her in *Casina* 819, ut potior Pollentia sit, and *Rudens* 530. The connection with the games denotes physical strength. Compare Valentia. The action of the decree of the Senate and the position of the statue in a public sacred place show that the cult was in charge of the state. Peter (Roscher II. 216) considers Pollentia as probably one of the spirits of the Indigitamenta; so Preller II, p. 213.

PIETAS.—The goddess of dutiful affection had two main temples in the same vicinity—one founded in 181 B. C. in the Forum Holitorium, the other near the Circus Flaminius some time before 91 (Obsequens 54). Amatucci (*Rivista di storia antica* VII. 1, pp. 25–32) ingeniously argues that the latter was the older cult and was founded probably between 233 and 215 B. C. His theory rests on Cic. *De legg.* ii. 28, where Mens, Pietas, Virtus, and Fides, he maintains, are quoted in reverse chronological order. But this is not strictly true, for the cult of Virtus was founded in 205, and even if here Cicero may have been thinking of Honos (233), with whom Virtus was joined, yet, if the other passages in which he mentions these four typical deities of abstraction be examined, it will be seen at once that he keeps no fixed order. Note, for example, *De legg.* ii. 19, Mentem Virtutem Pietatem Fidem. The supposition that this cult was known as Pietas patria, and that the other in the Forum Holitorium was Pietas Graeca, is absolutely without support, and hence the association and origin from Aeneas, the pater indiges, is not plausible.

The origin of the cult, in fact, is unknown, but Wissowa's conjecture (*R.-K.*, p. 275) of an act of devotion between father and son in battle is certainly attractive. The Greek story of the maid who nursed her father (or mother—the tradition varies) is entirely etiological and rightly rejected. (Cf. the extension of the story by Solinus i. 124, 125.) Plautus probably alludes to the cult in *Asinaria* 506 and 508, Pietatem piem, Pietatem colere; *Curculio* 639, Pietas mea; and *Bacchides* 1176, mea Pietas; the latter play having been composed as late as 189, two years after the temple was vowed by Glabrio.

As to the external features of the cult we have no evidence, except that in Gaul a flamen was attached to the worship of the goddess, if the restoration of the following inscription from various fragments by Chenesseau (in charge of the Thermae Neriomagenses) be correct: Numinibus Aug. et Nerio deo usibusq. r. p.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Bit(urigum) Cub. et. vic. flam(en) Rom(ae) et Aug(usti) itemque flamen Pietatis (*CIL.* XIII, addenda no. 1376).

FELICITAS.—This deity is very close in function to Fortuna on the one side and Bonus Eventus on the other. She represents prosperity, whether secured by good luck or by effort, while Bonus Eventus stands for the good issue or success of some definite project. (See Augustine op. cit. iv. 18 for an extensive discussion of the distinction between Fortuna and Felicitas.) The first temple known to us was built in the Velabrum in 151 B. C. The supposition that the primary meaning of Felicitas was fertility is not convincingly substantiated (Steuding in Roscher I. 1473; Preller II, p. 356). Her earliest representation on coins of the Lollian gens has no symbols of fertility, and the later attributes of ears of grain only show one feature of the prosperity of the Empire and, like others—the cornucopia, caduceus, lance, etc.—are characteristic of other deities, of Fides for example. Moreover, the Pompeian inscription, Hic habitat Felicitas (IV. 1454), with the phallus, is most probably explained by J. Blanchet (Daremberg and Saglio, see Felicitas) as a motto accompanying the fascinus to avert the evil eye from the bakery in which it stood. Cf. *L'ann. épig.* 1904, no. 199, or Hülsen *Mitth. des Arch. Inst.* 1904, p. 152: invide, qui spectas, hec tibi poena manet.

Felicitas occurs on the inscriptions of the equites singulares at Rome directly after Mercury (VI. 31140–45, 48, 49) and on coins she has the caduceus, by which the prosperity of commerce is alluded to. She was one of the most important deities of imperial times, and together with Salus was frequently invoked by the Arval Brothers directly after Jupiter and Juno and Minerva; in the prayer for Nero and Poppaea in 65–66 A. D. she is the only deified abstract mentioned. Numerous sacrifices were made to her under the individualizing names Felicitas imperii, ——Caesarum, ——publica, ——Aug.

The divinity with whom she was usually associated was, of course, Fortuna. In common with Victoria she had a cult at Ameria, with priests and flamens of high civil and military rank (*CIL.* XI. 4367, 4371, 4373, 4395). It had special relations with the princes of the ruling house, and the lusus iuvenum were a part of the worship.[17] A fragmentary calendar (XI. 4346) found in the

[17] Blanchet loc. cit., p. 782 apparently takes the word Caesaris to refer to

same place, showing the festivals of certain deities and the victims of sacrifice, has Victoria, Felicitas (?), and Fortuna in order. The mention of the Augustales in these inscriptions shows a close relation to the worship of the emperors. The guild names itself after Victoria and Felicitas, and may be compared with the iuvenes Herculani (X. 5657) and iuvenes Nepessini Dianenses (XI. 3210).

Bonus Eventus.—We do not know when Bonus Eventus became a public deity, but our earliest evidence is the representation of his head on a coin of L. Scribonius Libo, 54 B. C. (Babelon op. cit. II, p. 427). No temple is mentioned until 375 A. D. (Amm. Marc. xxix. 6. 19), when a porticus in the Campus Martius was said to have taken its name, Eventus Bonus, from the proximity of a temple of this god. But either as a popular or as a public deity he was widely honored in the early stages of the republic, for he is named with Venus, Minerva, Robigus, and others as one of the twelve agricultural gods (Varro *De re rust.* i. 1. 6; but see note, p. 63). Varro defines eventus as successus, and the sphere of the god was extended in course of time so that he became the patron of success in any undertaking and differed little in function from Fortuna and Felicitas. Cf. Lucan *Phars.* iv. 730, fraudibus eventum Fortuna. In two sepulchral inscriptions (VI. 26554, 2335) Bonus eventus stands probably as a supposed address to the passer-by equivalent to ἀγαθὴ τύχη, which is more strictly bona fortuna. Domaszewski (*Westdeutsche Zeitschrift* XXIV [1905], pp. 76 f.) has shown that he was more especially a god of commerce, and he links this province with that of agriculture through the fact that the word fruges, which in early prayers, like Cato *De re rust.* 141, 2, utique tu fruges . . . . grandire beneque evenire siris (cf. Paulus, p. 220, id sacrificium fiebat ob frugum eventum), had the meaning "crops," gained later the meaning "profit."

The primary specification of the god's function was preserved in art and on coins, where wheat-ears are the usual attributes. He is commonly represented on brick-stamps (XV. 1671), gems (XI. 6716), bas-reliefs (VII. 97), as a nude youth with chlamys hanging from the left arm and ears of grain in the right hand. Euphranor made a statue representing him holding a bowl in the right hand and poppies and grain in the left (Plin. *N. H.* xxxiv. 77). A group statue of Bonus Eventus and Bona Fortuna by Praxiteles

the emperor. The *Corpus* is inconsistent in filling out Caesar(um) or Caesar(is) in XI. 4373 and 4395.

stood upon the Capitoline (Plin. xxxvi. 23; Domaszewski loc. cit., p. 79), and a marble relief representing the same deities is still extant in Great Britain. In the latter, Bonus Eventus is pictured as wearing the toga and the limus, and is pouring out a libation upon an altar[18] (Domaszewski, p. 74).

Bonus Eventus is found with the cognomen Augustus in only one inscription: II. 4612, Bono Event(o) Aug(usto) sacr. P. Aemilius Gemellus sevir Aug(ustalis). But this shows an intimate connection with the worship of the emperor. Cf. also V. 4203, Bonum Eventum sevir(orum) sociorum Sex. Numisius Fortunatus et L. Lucretius Primianus seviri Aug(ustales). Several inscriptions reveal interesting motives for the worship of this god. In VIII. 18890 a man willed an altar probably to commemorate his successful life; in II. 1471 a priestess set up a tablet on account of the honor of being chosen to hold the ludi circenses. Another, III. 1128, is very obscure because of its mutilated condition. In it the phrase naturae Boni Eventus occurs, in which the god is generally recognized by scholars. Mommsen thought the deity here presided over the working of a mine. Domaszewski (loc. cit., p. 77) thinks that behind the name an oriental god was obscured, as also, probably, in III. 8244, Domnae reginae et Domno et Bono Evento. It is also possible that the phrase contains merely common nouns, viz., naturae boni eventus.

B. OF THE EMPIRE

During the last century of the Republic no new abstract deities appear to have been added to the state religion. With the establishment of Felicitas the movement for enshrining the virtues died out. Was this due to a feeling that they had been covered thoroughly, and to opposition on the part of the pontiffs against a further extension of this cycle of deities for fear of going to ridiculous extremes? Possibly it was due more to the growing skepticism or to the internal dissensions which so racked the city and engrossed the chief magistrates that they were more intent on using the religious machinery of the state for political ends than on establishing new deities. At any rate, the generals of this period vowed in battle no temples to qualities of which they stood in special need, but each took some one of the greater gods as his patron—as Sulla took

[18] Aust (Pauly-Wissowa III, p. 716) says Bonus Eventus was represented by a female figure on coins of Septimius Severus (Cohen III. 63, 67), and Julia Domna (ibid. III. 9), but Cohen calls the figure Fides.

Venus Felix, Caesar Venus Genetrix—or else built shrines to deities already existing.

But with the final triumph of Caesar and the establishment of complete authority in a single head, and with the consequent adulation of the emperor as divine, new life was infused into abstract deifications, as men saw in them a special means of flattery to the ruler. Hence not only were the old deities specialized and restricted to the performance of this function of flattery (as has been shown above in the treatment of the individual cases), but new deifications were frequently made as often as any quality of the emperor, or any desirable condition pertaining to his house or reign, seemed particularly prominent. So, for example, as early as 44 B. C., the Senate deified Clementia and made this virtue the cult-associate of Caesar, which, as Plutarch saw (*Caesar* 57), was merely an exaggerated way of thanking the dictator for his mercy.

These deified abstracts, which sprang up in the Empire, I have collected in the following list. For many of them we lack the positive evidence of temples and other circumstances, and the explicit statement of ancient authorities, such as we find for those of the Republic, so that they are included by probability. On account of the lack in most cases of exact chronological data, the order is alphabetical.

AEQUITAS.—Aequitas was probably worshiped as a deity privately, if not by the state, during the republican period, for the bowl found at Vulci, dating between 350 and 200 B. C., inscribed Aecetiai pocolom, is now generally accepted as a votive offering to her, according to Ritschl's identification (*Opuscula* IV, p. 283; cf. Bormann ad *CIL.* XI. 6708). Arnobius IV. 1, 2 names her with Victoria and Pax as a typical, deified abstract; but Wissowa (*R.-K.*, p. 276 and n. 3), impugning this testimony without reason, denies the existence of any proof that this divinity ever had a state-cult. Absolute proof, to be sure, is lacking, but enough exists to make it very probable, as follows:

1. The bilingual altar-inscription published by S. Frankfurter (*Festschrift zu Otto Hirschfeld,* p. 440):

T. Pomponius [. . . .] Protomachus leg. Augg. pr. pr. Aequitati

Πρήξε[ως εἵνεκε] τῆσδε προτειμηθεὶς [ἀνέθ]ηκε[ν]
Πρωτόμαχος βῶμον Εὐδικίῃ σθεναρῇ.

This was set up outside the camp in an inclosed room, and was perhaps a tribunal of a propraetorian legate of the two Augusti

(circa 216–47 A. D.). The officer had it erected apparently to impress the natives with the purpose of the court. The objection to considering Aequitas a regular deity from the fact that Εὐδικίη is an entirely free subjective translation, and that therefore σθεναρῇ was conceived of as necessary (loc. cit., p. 442), seems to me to have little weight. Some word was necessary to fill out the line metrically, and the adjective σθεναρῇ met this need and characterized the power of the deity, and hence was used. Nor would Nemesis, which Frankfurter considers the likely Greek equivalent for a well-known Latin deity of this nature, fit the case here. Nemesis stands for justice in the sense of ruthless punishment for crime, but that is not the sense of Aequitas at all. Εὐδικίη = "Righteous dealing" (see Lidell and Scott) or "Fairness," is a much closer translation. Very likely most of the cases before this propraetor involved financial transactions, of which especially Aequitas was the protecting deity.

2. Compare the herm found at Mitrovizii (II. 6015[1].) which was apparently used as a weight representing a woman clad in tunic and wearing fillets, holding in front a horn, the whole inscribed Equetas (=Aequitas).

3. The idea of fair dealing is corroborated by an inscription from Dougga (*Nouvelles archives des missions scientifiques* XI. [1903], p. 48; *L'ann épig.* 1904, no. 119); Mercurio Aequitati Aug. P. Selicius. The position on the stone would favor the understanding of two deities, but if Aequitati is taken as cognomen of Mercury, as Libertas is of Jupiter, yet Aequitas is a divine concept and as such is fused and blended with Mercury.

Finally, Aequitas is represented on coins as early as Galba after the type of Moneta with the balance (Engelhard, p. 50, and Preller II, p. 267). These facts, taken together with Arnobius' explicit assertion, throw the burden of proof upon those denying the cult of Aequitas.

Aeternitas.—To judge from the figure of a temple with legend Aeternitati Augustae on coins of Octavius and Tiberius, this cult, like many others, began under Augustus in the colonies of Spain, e. g., in Emerita and Tarraco (Cohen I, October–August 585, 586, 727; Tib. 78–80, 166). It is restricted to the Empire, the emperor, and the city. The idea of eternity seems to have been closely associated with the sun, and its worship to have come from that of Baalim in Syria. (See article Aeternus, Pauly-Wissowa I, p. 696.)

The first representations of the goddess (on coins of Vespasian) have the flaming sun and crescent moon as her symbols, and inscriptions from Spain illustrate the association and genesis: Orelli 1925, Soli invicto et Lunae aeternae; *CIL.* II. 259, Soli Aeterno, Lunae pro aeternitate imperii; Orelli 1928, Aeternitati sacr(um), Soli et Lunae.

The first occurrence of this worship in Rome is found in the sacrifice of Aeternitas imperii after the suppression of the conspiracy of Piso (66 A. D.) by the Arval Brothers (*CIL.* VI. 2044. i. 6). For the application of the name directly to emperors in the late Empire see Cumont *Revue de l'histoire religieuse* I. (1896), pp. 435 ff.

ANNONA.—Although strictly a deity of the grain supply, a concrete idea, Annona in a wider sense was a goddess of plenty. Outside the coins, however, there are but few signs of her cult. An altar found in Rome on the arx has a bas-relief representing a female figure with right shoulder and arm bare and head decorated with a crescent diadem; with her right hand she drops ears of grain into a jar standing near; with her left she lifts an overflowing cornucopia. Beneath is the legend (*CIL.* VI. 22): Annonae sanctae Aelius Vitalio mensor perpetuus dignissimi corporis pistorum siliginariorum d(onum) d(edit). No doubt Annona was the patron deity of this corporation of millers. *CIL.* VIII. 7960 records the dedication of two statues in Numidia: . . . . Genium patriae n(ostrae) et Annonae[19] sacrae urbis. . . . . The dedication day was celebrated with shows and special largesses to the people. Of course, the deity was important to the Numidians, who did a thriving grain trade with Rome.

Another inscription (II. 4976[1].) is on a signet ring representing an altar marked Ann., but the decoration—viz., rams' and goats' heads, and a bird with a garland—does not suggest Annona. It is possible that the letters stand for the owner's name, the altar affording a convenient field for the engraving. A cippus (VI. 8470) was set up by a prefect of the grain supply to himself and family. Two figures flank the inscription, one representing a man standing in a ship with a grain-measure near by; the other, a woman dressed in a double tunic, identified as Annona by the *Corpus,* but inasmuch

[19] All authorities but the *Corpus* capitalize Annonae. I confess to a feeling that Wilmanns (ad loc.) may be right in reading and indexing it as a common noun.

as no symbols of the deity are described, the figure may be his wife. A square altar in Ostia (XIV. 51; see photograph in *Notizie* 1881, Pl. II) has the reading on the cornice of the front side, according to Lanciani, | | ram sac . . . . vAm Avggeni . . . . sacomar; according to Dessau in *CIL.* ad loc., | | ram sac | | | | | | | | onam, etc. From the photographic reproduction most of the text is doubtful before Genio, and there is scarcely a trace of the letter o in onam and not much more of the n, so that the reading—onam—is very doubtful, or too uncertain to allow us to cite this reading as more than conjectural. Statius *Silv.* i. 637 personifies the grain supply thus:

> . . . . et cum tot populos beata pascas
> hunc, Annona, diem superba nescis.

Clementia.—In 44 B. C. the Senate decreed a temple to Caesar and Clementia (Appian *B. C.* ii. 106), set up statues representing them as standing hand in hand, and placed Antonius as the flamen dialis over the priesthood of the temple (Dio. Cass. xliv. 6. 4), thus emphasizing its importance. This servile personification was the starting-point of the almost numberless deifications that soon followed. Again in 28 A. D. an altar was erected in honor of Clementia (Tac. *Ann.* iv. 74), and in 66 the Arvals record a sacrifice to her, both strangely enough in the reigns of vindictive tyrants.

Disciplina.—This was a cult restricted to the army, as the few extant inscriptions designate it as Disciplina militaris (VIII. 9832, 10657), or it came from camps (VII. 896; VIII. 18058). In all probability, Disciplina was deified by Hadrian in connection with his military reforms (Domaszewski *Westd. Zeits.* 1895, pp. 44 f.).

Fecunditas.—In 63 A. D. the Senate voted a temple to Fecunditas in connection with the birth of a daughter to Poppaea (Tac. *Ann.* xv. 23). Afterward this made-to-order goddess was figured on coins, but there is no evidence that she was worshiped by the people.

Indulgentia.—Little distinction can be seen between this deity and Clementia, except that the latter has to do with leniency toward error, the former to the granting of favors. Our first trustworthy evidence of Indulgentia's place in state-cults dates from 210 A. D., when a praefectus coloniarum at Cirta, Africa, erected a small shrine with a bronze statue of Indulgentia domini nostri (VIII. 7095–98). Also a statue of Indulgentia novi saeculi Imp. Caes. M. Antoni Gordiani (VIII. 20487, 238–44 A. D.) may have stood at

Castellum Thib. (?). On coins, however, her image was stamped as early as Hadrian's reign. The only sign of a cult is found in the plausible identification of this goddess by Wissowa *R.-K.*, p. 279, with Εὐεργεσία, to whom Dio Cassius lxxi. 34. 3 says Marcus Aurelius built a temple on the Capitoline, using an entirely new name. Juvenal vii. 20, Indulgentia ducis, and Statius *Silv.* ii. 125 are probably allusions to the cult.

IUSTITIA.—It has been generally agreed that the cult of Iustitia began about the time of Tiberius (Preller II, p. 266; Wissowa, p. 276), but a definite terminus post quem has not been attempted. From Ovid (*Epist.*) *ex Ponto* iii. 6. 23–26, we can with great probability fix the date within comparatively narrow limits. Ovid says:

> Crede mihi, miseris caelestia numina parcunt
> nec semper laesos et sine fine premunt
> principe nec nostro deus est moderatior ullus.
> Iustitia vires temperat ille suas.
> Nuper eam Caesar facto de marmore templo,
> iampridem posuit mentis in aede suae.

This seems to indicate that Augustus built a temple and established the cult; for, while the phrase facto de marmore templo is ambiguous in meaning, and may possibly refer to a temple of some deity other than Iustitia, and may be a pure locative, yet it more probably refers to a temple of Iustitia and is ablative absolute with locative association. For, first, the phrase is too full and complete for the simple meaning "in a marble temple," and, secondly, the whole feeling of the passage shows that the temple of Iustitia is meant. Ovid intended to say that Caesar has emphasized the divinity of justice by building an external temple for her abode, but that long before he had enshrined her in the sanctuary of his mind. Much of the force of the contrast would be lost by the interpretation, "he set up a statue of Justice in some other (unknown) temple." The poet was thinking of the founding of the cult in the emperor's mind as prior to its establishment in a public material temple.

Now, the poet published his first three books of letters in the latter part of 13 A. D. The letter with which we are concerned was one of the later ones written to some influential Roman from whom he had failed to get permission to use his name in a previous letter. It, therefore, was written not long before the publication of this

collection of letters together. (See Schanz *Römische Litteraturgeschichte* II. 1, p. 225; Teuffel-Schwabe I, p. 504.) We can therefore infer from nuper, l. 25, that the temple of Iustitia was built by Augustus in the early part of 13 A. D. This fits well with the notice in the Fasti Capitolini for January 8: Signum Iustitiae Augus[tae . . . . dedicatum Planco (?) et Silio cos.] (13 A. D.), whose lost part would doubtless mention the temple. At all events it is certain that Augustus personally gave prestige to the worship of this goddess as a state-cult, or else Ovid's lines lose their point.

Only a few inscriptions to Iustitia are extant, and the cult is not reflected in literature, though justice personified is frequent, especially in poetry. But here she is the Greek mythical character, identified most commonly with Erigone or Astraea, who left the earth ultima caelestium (Ovid *Fasti* i. 249; Verg. *Geor.* ii. 474) with Pudicitia, her sister; but she is also the same as Themis (Hor. *Carm.* ii. 17. 16), or Dike, in character.

Quite a different character is given her as equivalent to Nemesis or Adrasteia, which some bilingual inscriptions show (e. g., X. 3812; see Nemesis below). Ammianus Marcellinus (xiv. 11. 25), however, says the "theologi veteres" considered her the mother of Nemesis. Macrobius (*Sat.* i. 21, 24), as if explaining a statue, gives an almost inexplicable application to the name, viz.: Virgo autem quae manu aristam refert, quid aliud quam δύναμις ἡλιακή quae fructibus curat? et ideo Iustitia creditur, quae sola facit nascentes fructus ad usus hominum pervenire. Aulus Gellius (xiv. 4) describes her features as depicted according to Chrysippus, viz.: a pictoribus rhetoribusque antiquioribus ad hunc ferme modum; forma atque filo virginali aspectu, vementi et formidabili, luminibus oculorum acribus, neque humilis neque atrocis sed reverendae cuiusdam tristitiae dignitate.

Pax.—An altar of Pax Augusta was decreed by the Senate on the return of Augustus from Spain, July 4, 13 B. C., and dedicated January 30, 9 B. C. Both days were kept in the calendars as feriae publicae. On still another day, March 30, 10 A. D., Augustus set up a statue to her, with others to Janus, Salus, and Concordia (Dio Cass. liv. 35. 2). But it is likely that she was worshiped before this time, for a coin of 44 B. C. (Babelon II. 23) shows her face, and we may therefore ascribe her to Caesar.

Of course this cult had greatest éclat after wars; hence in the Empire her likeness is especially frequent on coins of Galba, Ves-

pasian, and others. Cf. *CIL.* II. 3732: [Caesari] *T. Imp. Vespasiano Aug. Vespasiani f(ilio) conser*[va]*tori Pacis Aug(ustae)*. It is not necessary to refer at length to the great temple built by Vespasian and stored with the richest works of Greek art, described by Pliny the Elder (*N. H.* xii. 94; xxxiv. 84; xxxv. 74). Its destruction by fire in 192 A. D. under Commodus caused a great popular tumult.

Since the temple of Janus was closed in times of peace, this deity was often coupled with him; e. g., Ovid *Fasti* i. 121:

> cum libuit (*sc.* Iano) Pacem placidis emittere tectis
> libera perpetuas ambulat illa vias.

(Cf. Hor. *Epist.* ii. 1. 255, custodem pacis . . . . Ianum; and Stat. *Silv.* iv. 1. 13 ff.) Hence, in 66 A. D., the Arval Brothers include her in their prayers at the closing of the temple of Janus (*CIL.* VI. 2044. i. 12; cf. VI. 32347a). She is also associated with Mars (Brambach *CIRh.* 484; Wilmanns *Exempla* 150; aram dicavit sospiti Concordiae Granno Camenis Martis et Pacis Lari qui[n e]t deorum stirpe genito Caesari). But only once besides this does she occur in military inscriptions (Brambach 55 = Dessau 3094).

Her symbol was the well-known olive-branch, and besides this she is adorned often with wheat-ears and poppies, since she brought prosperity to agriculture. (See Tibullus i. 10. 67.) As is the case with one or two other qualities, a presiding spirit or genius is ascribed to her in *CIL.* VIII. 17832: Genio Pacis. Compare the coin in Cohen V, no. 295, where under the superscription Pacis Event. a genius bears wheat-ears and poppy in the same way that Pax is shown (ibid., no. 296).

Providentia.—Probably Augustus also established the cult of Providentia Augusta, to whom an altar is mentioned as erected in the acts of the Arvals (which show that this goddess was worshiped publicly in the reigns of Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, Nero, Nerva, Severus, and Commodus). Originally the reference was to the foresight of the emperor, but in the later period it shifted to the providence of the gods over the ruler; e. g., Providentiam deorum (VI. 2099; III. 18). The extant inscriptions were nearly all set up either by resolution of the Senate (X. 6310), by the Arval Brothers, or by a proconsul (III. 12036) or other officials (e. g., sevir Augustalis, XI. 4170). We are warranted from this fact, as well as from the small number of inscriptions, in assuming this cult to be an indirect

official means of flattering the emperor, and without popular influence. In literature Apuleius *Met.* vi. 15, nec Providentiae bonae graves oculos anima latuit aerumna, possibly has the deity in mind.

PUDICITIA.—Although the traditional story of a sanctuary of Pudicitia patricia in the Forum Boarium (Liv. x. 23. 3) has been shown to be legendary (Wissowa *Anal. Röm. topog.*, pp. 5 ff.; *R.-K.*, pp. 207 and 277), and the deity identified with the veiled statue in the temple of Fortuna Virgo, and these two names interchanged for the same cult, yet the chapel of Pudicitia plebeia in the Vicus Longus must have gone back far into antiquity. We cannot determine whether this cult became official in the republican period or not, but in the Empire it was brought into close relation with the worship of the ruling house, since the phrase ara Pudicitiae is found on coins of the period of Trajan, and Pudicitia Aug. is on later mintage (Cohen op. cit., Index: cf. *CIL.* VIII. 993). However, before this time Valerius Maximus (vi. praef. 1) had connected the cult with Livia as follows: tu Palatii columen augustos Penates sanctissimumque Iuliae genialem torum adsidua celebras, tuo praesidio puerilis aetatis insignia munita sunt, tui numinis respectu sincerus iuventae flos permanet, te custode matronalis stola censetur: ades igitur et recognosce quae fieri ipsa voluisti. Propertius too (ii. 6. 25),

> templa Pudicitiae quid opus statuisse puellis
> si cuivis nuptae quidlibet esse licet.

may possibly be referring to real temples, and not only to the sacellum in the Vicus Longus; but of this we cannot be sure, for like others he may have called the temple of Fortuna Virgo in the Forum Boarium (Varro *Nonius* 189) by the name of Pudicitia.[20]

The original cult admitted only matronae univiriae as devotees (Liv. loc. cit.), which may have been the regulation enforced throughout. On the other hand, Valerius Maximus (loc. cit.) treats it very broadly as including both sexes and all ages. In mythical lore Pudicitia was commonly associated with Iustitia as the last of the virtues to leave the earth after the golden age of Saturn (Juvenal vi. 1 ff.; Claudian. i. 294). Inscriptions are rare.

[20] Rothstein's suggestion (ad loc.), that Propertius' words alluded to a restoration of these two cults, is plausible, but the whole matter is obscure.

In one (III. 14156) she is joined with Pietas, and in others (X. 6351; VI. 1341) the chastity of married women is commemorated.

SECURITAS.—The earliest notice of this deity is in the Acta Arvalium (*CIL.* VI. 2051, l. 30), 60 A. D., but the phrase Securitas Augusti appears on coins of Nero. She was officially identified with the worship of the imperial house; e. g., XIV. 2899, Securitati Aug. sacrum, decuriones populusque coloniae Praenestinae. In the reign of Trajan a public vow was offered to her (Tac. *Agr.* 3), and in Caracalla's time a bronze statue of Securitas saeculi was set up in Cirta, Africa (VIII. 7095–98). This is the only public evidence of her worship as a state-cult.

Apparently there was a private worship of her as the protectress of the dead. For not only do we meet with the phrases dis securitatis (VI. 2268), dibus (= dis) securis, and securitati suae (= pro securitate sua) (XIII. 2811) in place of the usual dis manibus, but also inscriptions such as Securitati sacr(um) Valerius . . . . fecit (VI. 28047), Securitati perpetuae in memoriam (VI. 25607), Securitati sacrum Iulia Phoebe sibi . . . . (VI. 9016), show that Securitas was vaguely deified and took the place of the di manes. In this way she is often joined with Memoria (see below); e. g., VI. 18378; cf. III. 7436.

TUTELA.—Definite data of the existence of Tutela among the state-cults are lacking, but numerous inscriptions with and without the cognomen Augusta on altars from all parts of the Empire and on coins as early as Vitellius make her position almost certain. She affords a good illustration of the elevation of a pure appellative to a deification; for the various steps of the process are seen in numerous inscriptions. The starting-point is found in such phrases as tutela Iunonis, ——Neptuni, ——Minervae on the menologia rustica, showing under whose watch-care each month is. (Cf. also tutela Minervae of a ship, Ovid *Trist.* i. 10. 1; tutela Iovis, *CIL.* V. 4243 and XII. 1837, has probably this sense rather than "Jupiter's protecting deity.") Then, when the exact deity who should be the protector was unknown, a worshiper would erect an altar deo tutelae or deo in cuius tutela domus est (XIII. 246; II. 4092; VI. 573). From this it was an easy step to the next stage in which the protecting spirit of a special place was called "Protection," especially since tutela was sometimes used concretely ("protector" or "guardian"); e. g., Ovid *Met.* viii. 711, prorae tutela Melanthus; Hor. *Carm.* iv. 14. 43, O tutela praesens Italiae (i. e., Augustus); Hor.

OF CALIFORNIA

Epist. i. 1. 103, rerum tutela mearum Cum sis, with which compare curator a praetore datus used a line before with similar meaning.

This spirit, "Protection" or "Protectress," had her counterpart in the Genius, who developed from a spirit of the power of generation attending a man to one of protection guarding both men and places. Accordingly, Tutela and Genius are frequently named together to give a place full protection (III. 4445; VI. 216) and Tutela was introduced among the household deities of every family (Hieron. *Comm. in S. Isaiam* 672: ipsaque Roma orbis domina in singulis insulis domibusque Tutelae simulacrum cereis venerans ac lucernans quam ad tuitionem aedium isto appellant ut tam intrantes quam exeuntes domos suas inoliti semper commoneantur erroris; cf. *CIL.* II. 4082, Laribus et [Tu]telae, Genio. . . .). But the conception of Tutela was more far-reaching than that of Genius; for she was not confined always to a particular place or person, but was a broader abstraction, like Fortuna and Victoria, and as such had a temple at Bordeaux, of whose portico remains are still visible (XIII. 583), and at Perigueux (XIII. 939), sacerdos Arensia qui templum deae Tutelae et thermas public(as) utraq(ue) ol[im] vestustate collabsa sua pecunia restituit). . . . .

The above conception of the origin of this goddess, it will be seen, differs from that of Wissowa (*R.-K.*, p. 156), who considers Tutela an offshoot of Genius, the deus in cuius tutela hic locus est. But the complete phrase in the reference this scholar cites, viz. (Henzen *Acta Arvalium,* p. 146), sive deo sive deae in cuius tutela hic lucus locusve est, oves II, compared with the common phrase, sive deo sive deae oves II (Henzen op. cit., p. 144), shows that the Arvals were not thinking expressly of the Genius loci, but of some one of the other gods or goddesses, known or unknown, whose function it was to protect that place. If they had conceived of the Genius alone, there would have been no occasion for using the ambiguous formula, where both a male and a female deity were included. The phrase sive deo sive deae is regularly used with wider reference than to the special Genius (cf. Aul. Gell. ii. 28; Macr. iii. 9. 7; Arnob. iii. 8, and other citations in Wissowa *R.-K.*, p. 33, n. 2), and its use in the acts of the Arvals is simply another example. It is quite true, as Henzen (ibid.) says, that the sive deus sive dea, etc., is practically equivalent in function to a spirit protecting a place (p. 146, "Idem FERE est qui Genius luci vel loci"), but that it is not exactly the same is proved by the addition of the

feminine dea. The phrases deo tutelae Genio and Genio tutelae (II. 3377, 4092, 2991) show nothing more than that the Genius was a deity of protection. But so also was Fortuna, who is so often coupled with Tutela (VI. 177, 179, 216) and is called dea Fortuna tutatrix huius loci in one case (XII. 4183), and has the cognomen Tutela (VI. 178; cf. Carter *De deor. Rom. cogn.*, p. 47). In fact, all the gods were thought of as protectors of certain places; e. g., aedem aramque I. O. M. et Silvano sancto ceterisque diis quorum in tutela aedificium est; VI. 343, Hercules tutator; XI. 1549, Iuppiter tutator; X. 3799, Hercules tutor; XIV. 25, Iuppiter tutor (cf. Carter loc. cit.). Any deity whose figure was on the stern of a vessel was called its tutela (Ovid *Trist.* i. 10. 1; Petr. 105, 108). Much easier, therefore, is it to derive the deity Tutela from this general conception of protection than from any one god. Neither is she to be looked upon as a female Genius or as about equivalent to a Juno, since both men and women pay vows to her (cf. VI. 31054, Tutele sancte Aurelius Urbanus ex voto; XIII. 411, Tutelae sanctiss(imae) Chrysan[thus]; XIII. 159; VI. 30984).

Among the many inscriptions of this cult we may single out a few particularly interesting ones. With Hercules, Fides, and Fortuna she is a patron deity of a statio in Rome (*Mitth. des Arch. Inst.* 1904, p. 52), and soldiers also honored her (*L'ann. épig.* 1903, no. 369, Tutelae loci milites legionis eiusdem aedem . . . . aere collato). A ring found near Lyons bore a gem inscribed: Veneri et Tutelae votum (Boissier *Inscr. antiq. de Lyon,* p. 11).[21] In Gaul Tutela apparently was a favorite cult; cf. *CIL.* XIII. 57, 449, 328, besides the above-named inscriptions. Cognomina formed from city-names were attached to her name; e. g., Tutela Aug. Ussubia (XIII. 919), Tutela Tiriensis (*Eph. Epig.* VIII. 111a), Tutela Tarracon(ensis) (II. 4091).

A close connection of Tutela Aug. with the worship of the emperor may possibly be seen in *CIL.* II. 4056, Tutelae Aug. sacrum C. Terentius Onesimus ob honorem seviratus sui et in honorem C. Terenti Ursi fili. It is surprising that a cult so well attested by

[21] The fact that Venus Anadyomene is possibly alluded to by the representation of a dolphin on a necklace discovered among the same relics with the ring is merely a coincidence and is no sign that Tutela was peculiarly a maritime deity. No other evidence is at hand. Doubtless, however, she was invoked by sailors as by other people.

inscriptions should find such little recognition in literature. Petronius 57, ita Tutelam huius loci habeam propitiam, is our only reference.

II. ABSTRACTS POPULARLY BUT NOT OFFICIALLY WORSHIPED

Under this heading are included such unofficial deifications as seem to have had real worship, more or less localized. The data, however, are in most cases very fragmentary—mere traces which it is difficult to view in their true bearings.

COPIA.—Wissowa *R.-K.*, p. 276, has well pointed out the lack of convincing proof that the worship of Copia was ever a state-cult. The evidence adduced by Peter in Roscher from the colonies of Copia (191 B. C.) at Thurii (Strabo spells it Copiae) and Lugdunum 43 B. C. is without much weight; for these colonies were often named from pure qualities never deified; e. g., Claritas Iulia Augusta, Placentia. On the other hand, we cannot slight, as Wissowa does, the inscription found at Avignon: Sex. Veratius Priscae l(ibertus) Pothus Copiae v. s. l. m. (XII. 1023); nor ascribe it to an unknown Gallic deity. The name of the donor is not Gallic, and Copia, it seems to me, is a condition so desired and dear to the average person's heart that it was likely to be deified very early, and it is probable that she had her devotees, as Fortuna and Bonus Eventus had. So Plautus *Pseud.* 736, Di immortales! non Charinus mihi hicquidem sed Copiast, had very likely a real goddess in mind.

MUNDITIES.—On the Capitoline basis dating from 136 A. D. in the reign of Trajan (*CIL.* VI[1], p. 480), which gives a list of the vici with their respective magistri, occurs the name Vico Mundiciei under Regio XIII, third column, line 41. Now, inasmuch as very many of these vici (almost half of them at least) are named from some prominent topographical feature, such as a public building, city-gate, temple, altar, shrine, or statue, and perhaps a private house—e. g., Piscinae Publicae, Portae Naeviae, Columnae Ligneae, Honor(is) et Virtut(is), Trium Ararum, Statuae Valerianae—it is probable that Mundiciei also refers to some religious monument, probably a shrine, since many deities with recognized cults are mentioned, as Fortuna Obsequens, F. Respiciens, F. Huiusque Diei, Venus, Apollo, Diana, and others. This goddess, "Cleanliness," may well have been a private cult or even encouraged by the state as a means of keeping the city in a sanitary condition.

Perhaps the thirteenth region, which took in the Aventine and lay near the river, had special need to worship this idea, because it contained the grain- and oil-warehouses.[22] In view of this probable cult, it may be that, when Plautus *Cas.* 1. 225 says magis nimio munditiis Munditiam antideo, he had a recognized goddess in mind. The compiler of the spurious book of the fifteenth century on the city regions under the name P. Victor (see Teuffel-Schwabe, §432. 7), copying this stone, recorded Mundities as a deity whose shrine was still to be seen (Hartung *Die Religion der Römer* II. 264).

NATIO.—This was not a Roman deity nor a general abstraction, but a special deity of child-birth, honored in Ardea. Cic. *De nat. deor.* iii. 47: Quodsi tales dii sunt, ut rebus humanis intersint, Natio quoque dea putanda est: cui cum fana circuimus in agro Ardeati rem divinam facere solemus; quae, quia partus matronarum tueatur, a nascentibus Natio nominata est.

NEMESIS.—This goddess of retribution is a late arrival among Roman deities. Her name was brought over from the Greek without translation, and doubtless her cult was one of the sacra peregrina (Ausonius xviii. 17. 66; cf. x. 379). We have no evidence of a temple in Rome, but in the late Empire at least it is probable that she was worshiped in the city, especially by gladiators, of whom she was a patron deity. (Cf. A. von Premerstein in *Philologus* LIII. [1894], pp. 407 ff.) Pliny the Elder (*N. H.* xxviii. 22 and xi. 251) mentions a statue standing on the Capitoline, which in all probability was merely decorative.

Outside Italy she had temples at Aquincum in Pannonia and Apuli in Dacia (III. 10439; III. 14474), and the cult was highly regarded by soldiers located in this vicinity and in western Thrace, where she was closely associated with Diana and blended with her as a cognomen (III. 14076, 10440). In one case she was represented in the form and clothing of Diana. With other deities also she was identified; e. g., Juno (Apul. *Met.* xi. 5; *CIL.* III. 11121), Nortia (Mart. *Capella* i. 88), Fortuna (*CIL.* III. 1125); cf. Julius Capitolinus in *Scriptores Augusti* xxi. 8. 6: Nemesis, id est vis quaedam Fortunae. Macrobius (i. 22. 1) calls her solis potestas. Ammianus (xiv. 11. 25) says the older theologians conceived her to be the daughter of Iustitia. Cf. *CIL.* X. 3812, Iustitiae Nemesi.

[22] That Mundicies = Mundities is agreed. See Stolz und Schmalz *Lateinische Grammatik* (ed. 1900), p. 24; Lindsay *Latin Language*, p. 88.

There were a guild of priests called amici Nemesiaci (*CIL.* II. 5191) and possibly flamens in Spain (II. 2195). For an exhaustive discussion of the phases of this cult see von Premerstein loc. cit.; Rosbach in Roscher III, pp. 138, 139.

QUIES.—To judge from Livy iv. 41. 8, the common people of Latium worshiped Quies as early as 423 B. C., when there was a shrine on the via Labicana; but Augustine (*De civ. dei* iv. 16) declares that the cult was never adopted officially: Quietem vero appellantes, quae faceret quietum, cum aedem haberet extra portam Collinam, publice illam suscipere noluerunt. The supposition of Wissowa that Augustine was referring to Livy's passage, and so had the same shrine in mind, but carelessly made a mistake in the location, perhaps from memory, is supported by the fact that Varro is probably not Augustine's source for this statement, since none of the other Christian Fathers, depending upon Varro, mention Quies in their lists. The location of the chapel on the via Labicana would suggest that the allusion was to rest from journeying, without, however, any connotation of quiet. But Ammianus (xix. 11. 6), ... ut diuturno otio involuti et Quietem colentes tamquam salutarem tributariorum onera subirent et nomen, uses the term as almost synonymous with Pax and this may be the meaning above. Statius (*Theb.* x. 89; *Silv.* i. 6. 91) fancies Quies as "Repose," in the company of "Sleep" and "Laziness." On sepulchral inscriptions Quies is joined with Securitas; e. g., VI. 16061: Quieti et Securitati Compses; VI. 22337: Quieti et Securitati Fadius . . . . Fadia max[ima] . . . . . In VI. 25565, with Fortuna, Spes, Pietas, and Victoria, Quies is joined as a sepulchral deity.

VALENTIA.—This goddess of strength and vigor was honored at Ocriculum in Umbria (Tertullian *Apol.* 24). Mommsen (*Eph. Epig.* II. [1877], p. 86) conjectured that the inscription on the fragment of the Hemerologii Allifani for August 12, Herculi in . . . . v. v. h. v. v. Felicit, should be restored to Herculi invicto . . . . et Veneri victrici, Honori Virtuti Valentiae Felicitati.

To this class of divinities may be added a few of the "specialist deities" ("Sondergottheiten," Usener) springing from the ancient Roman belief in spirits, which represented mental concepts to a certain extent, although restricted to particular spheres:

MORTA, goddess of death (Tert. *Ad nat.* ii. 15).

PAVENTIA or PAVENTINA, who caused fright among children (August. iv. 11; Tert. ii. 11).

PECUNIA. See below.

PRAESTITIA or PRAESTANA, presiding over superiority or excellence (Tert. ii. 11, habent [*sc.* deam] praestantiae, Praestitiam), applied particularly to the superiority of Romulus in throwing the spear (Arnobius iv. 3).

SENTINUS, who aided the thought of children (August. vii. 2. 3; Tert. ibid.).

STRENIA, quae faceret strenuum (August. iv. 16. 11). A shrine stood on the Via sacra (Varro *L.L.* v. 47).

TUTILINA, protectress of the stored harvest (Varro *L.L.* v. 163).

VICA POTA. See below, p. 47.

VOLETA, VOLUMNA, or VOLUMNUS, the spirit that fostered the will of children (Tert. ibid.; August. iv. 21; Min. Felix, *Oct.* 25).

VOLUPIA.—The exact underlying conception in this goddess is uncertain, but according to Augustine (iv. 8. 11) and Tertullian (ii. 11) she presided over contentment and satisfaction in youth. Varro (*L.L.* v. 164) refers to a chapel, and Macrobius (i. 10. 8) to an altar. Cf. Festus (ed. Egger), fr. 26. The chapel was on the Nova Via on the Palatine. Her festival was December 21. (See Mommsen's restoration of the Fasti Praenestini, *CIL.* I, p. 319.) The reason for the worship of Angerona in this shrine is obscure, (cf. Roscher I, p. 233).

PECUNIA.—According to Arnobius iv. 9, quis ad extremum deam Pecuniam esse credet, quam velut maximum numen vestrae indicant litterae donare anulos aureos, loca in ludis atque in spectaculis priora, honorum suggestus summos, amplitudinem magistratus, et quod maxime pigri ament, securum per opulentias otium, Pecunia was a deity of wealth. But Juvenal i. 113 says: etsi, funesta pecunia, templo nondum habitas, nullas nummorum ereximus aras; and Seneca *prov.* 5 §2: non sunt divitiae bonum; itaque habeat illas et Elius leno, ut homines pecuniam, cum in templis consecraverint [i. e., made wealth sacred by storing it in temples] videant et in fornice; which show that there was no cult of Pecunia at least in the historical period.

Accordingly, the explanation has been advanced that Arnobius

here and Augustine op. cit. iv. 21, misunderstanding such jokes and personifications as in Horace *Epist.* i. 6. 37,

> Scilicet uxorem cum dote fidemque et amicos
> et genus et formam regina Pecunia donat
> ac bene nummatum decorat Suadela Venusque,

considered them gods. But this overlooks the fact that Augustine was arguing against Varro's explanation of the many gods as cognomina of the one god Jupiter. Cf. vii. 6: Dicit ergo idem Varro adhuc de naturali theologia praeloquens deum se arbitrari esse animam mundi et hunc ipsum mundum esse deum. Now, in vii. 11 he says: et inter eius alia cognomina legerem, quod etiam Pecunia vocaretur, quam deam inter eos minuscularios invenimus. . . . . Sed cum et mares et feminae habeant pecuniam, cur non et Pecunia et Pecunius appellatus sit, sicut Rumina et Ruminus, ipsi viderint; ch. xii: Quam vero eleganter rationem huius nominis reddiderunt. "Et Pecunia," inquit, "vocatur, quod eius sunt omnia." Clearly, therefore, Augustine is quoting Varro, and the latter named two deities, Jupiter Pecunia and Pecunia. Such detailed statements and apparent quotations hardly admit of the supposition that Augustine is erroneous in referring Pecunia to the list given by Varro (R. Agahd *Jahrb. für Philol.* XXIV. [1898], p. 220; cf. also Peter in Roscher II, p. 145). Arnobius is generally held to have depended on Cornelius Labeo (Schanz op. cit. VIII. 3, p. 164), who Agahd (p. 123) thinks drew from Verrius Flaccus as his source.

In view of these facts, it is easiest to consider Pecunia one of the spirits of the Indigitamenta (possibly named by both Varro and Verrius Flaccus), who had entirely vanished, not only from worship, but from knowledge, in the period of Seneca and Juvenal. Whether Pecunia as a cognomen of Jupiter was a popular usage, or simply Varro's attempt to bring a distinct manifestation into relation with one god, is uncertain (Peter loc. cit. I, p. 173). It is plain, however, from such general phrases as "Pecunia (Iupiter) vocatur" that Augustine at any rate understood Varro to be reporting common custom and not his own theory.

Vica Pota.—The origin and function of this deity are very uncertain. She was worshiped in Cicero's time, and a sanctuary dedicated to her stood at the foot of the Velian hill in the early Empire, when she was completely identified with Victoria (Cic. *De legg.* ii. 11. 28; Asconius *ad Cic. in Pisonem* 52; Liv. ii. 7. 12; Plut. *Poplicola*

10). Almost all ancient and modern scholars derive the name from the verbs vinco and potior (which stand in the passage in Cicero above mentioned, but are probably glosses), and consider her one of the deities of the Indigitamenta, with the same office as the later Victoria. A few, however, seem to have regarded her as the goddess of food and drink, from victus and potus, and to have varied the name to Victua Potua (Arnobius iii. 25; cf. Wissowa *R.-K.*, p. 196). But the allusion in Seneca *Ludus de morte Caesaris* 9. 4 to Diespiter Vicae Potae et ipse designatus consul, nummariolus, has not been satisfactorily explained and has led Charles Hoeing (*Amer. Jour. of Philol.* XXIV, p. 323) to propose the etymology $\sqrt{\text{vik}}$ from Skr. vic., Lat. vicus and pot, Skr. pati. Accordingly, he translates Vica Pota by "mistress of the people" or "mistress of cities," and identifies her with Cybele, which explains Seneca's allusions. This ingenious explanation, however, lacks sufficiently convincing evidence to be preferred to the traditional identification with Victoria.

III. OCCASIONAL AND INDIVIDUAL DEIFICATIONS

Besides the public and popular deities that have been enumerated, there are many that cannot be said to have had a cult at all, with shrines and priests. Yet the altars and offerings that have come down to us show a certain degree of worship. These deities consist mainly of certain virtues and desirable conditions brought into such prominence by events that in each case the abstract quality is revered and deified, but only by an individual or individuals, and only with regard to a particular event. They are embryonic cults, which did not spread at all, because they were not of general importance and touched only special things and persons.

A fine illustration of the extent to which such manufacture of gods out of occasional appellatives was carried is given us by Tacitus (*Ann.* i. 14. 3), who, in describing the honors given Tiberius on his accession in 14 A. D., says: aramque Adoptionis et alia huiuscemodi prohibuit. The servile Senate proposed to deify, not a virtue, nor necessarily a desirable action, but merely one of the ordinary acts of the human family. And more than that, not even the idea of adoption in general, simply the particular adoption of Tiberius by Augustus, was thus to be venerated. Editors of Tacitus have quite generally called this altar, as well as those to Clementia and Amicitia (Tac. *Ann.* iv. 74), simply commemorative, and print the

words as common nouns. But something more than commemoration was the intent of the Senate. The altar denoted worship—sham, hypocritical worship, it is true, and in reality nothing but disguised obsequiousness; yet it was the form of worship exactly as much in essence as the temple to Fecunditas under Nero showed.

Instances of these occasional deifications attested in inscriptions and historical literature which I have collected are as follows:

Amicitia.—Tac. *Ann.* iv. 74: ita . . . . (*sc.* senatores) aram Clementiae, aram Amicitiae effigiesque circum Caesaris ac Seiani censuere. This took place in 28 A. D. when, as Tacitus himself says in the preceding sentence, pavor internus occupaverat animos, cui remedium adulatione quaerebatur.

Civitas.—*CIL.* VI. 88: Civitati sacrum A. Aemilius Artema fecit. As Artema is a slave-name of Greek origin from ἀρτεμής, it is likely that this man, on securing his manumission and becoming a citizen, set up an altar to his patron deity "Citizenship."

Dies Bonus.—*CIL.* VIII. 9323: Die Bono M. Allecimus Athictus dedit libens. Beneath is the figure of a boy, bonus puer Phosphorus. (Steuding in Roscher.) Perhaps Bonus Dies is another name for Phosphorus.

Fama.—This name occurs in two inscriptions in Spain (II. 1435) and Cologne (Orelli 5817), of which the former is reported second hand as reading Famae Aug. The cognomen, however, is probably not official, as Fama is entirely lacking on coins. The depreciating descriptions of Fama, as "Rumor," by Vergil, Horace, and Ovid, do not show the conception contained in these dedications. It is rather the same as the Greek Εὐκλεῖα, who had a temple in Athens. Cf. also the poetical fragment (Bährens V, pp. 421 f.), where Fama = Gloria and is mentioned with Venus, Cupid, and the Muses; Martial i. 25. 5:

> Ante fores stantem dubitas admittere Famam
> Teque piget curae praemia ferre tuae.

CIL. XI. 1517: Primisina Severina bone fame fidelisque. A colony existed in Spain named Fama Julia (Plin. *N. H.* iii. 14).

Gloria.—*CIL.* VIII. 6949: Gloriae Aug. sacrum—on altar from Cirta, Africa. Renown here is the sense as in Fama. (Wissowa *R.-K.*, p. 280, calls Gloria a pure appellative.)

Robur.—*CIL.* XIII. 1112: Deo Robori et Genio loci—Aquitania. If this inscription is genuine, and Robori is not the name of a

Celtic god, we may see in Robur a god of firmness against attack, presiding perhaps, over some fortification (cf. Hor. *Carm.* i. 3. 9, illi robur et aes triplex circa pectus erat); or, possibly, of vigor and strength with direct allusion to the picked troops (cf. Cic. *Ad fam.* x. 33, et robur et suboles militum interiit; Caes. *B. C.* iii. 87, quod fuit roboris duobus proeliis interiit); or of the prison (cf. Liv. xxxviii. 59; Tac. *Ann.* iv. 29).

Tempus Bonum.—*CIL.* III. 13747: Tempori Bono pro salute dominorum Imp. n. l. Septimi Severi Pertenacis (*sic*) et M. Aurel. Antonini Augg. et Septimi | | | | (Tyra, Moesia). This is an occasional deity referring, according to Matweew (*Acta soc. histor. et archaeol. Odessit.* 1890, August 23), to immunity from taxes granted the people of Tyra by Emperors Severus and Caracalla. Hence Tempus Bonum = "Happy Time" or "Good Fortune." This conclusion is suported by a Greek inscription containing a letter of the emperors to the same people for the same years (III. 781), referring to their generosity and the good fortune of the Tyrenses (*τῇ μεγάλῃ αὐτῶν τύχῃ*).

Testimonius or Testimonium.—*CIL.* VIII. 8246, 8247. Two priests of Saturn in Numidia offer eight various animals each as sacrifices to the d(i) b(oni)(?), including Jupiter, Hercules, Venus, and Mercury, among which is a wether to Testimonius (-um). The motive or meaning cannot be made out.

Ultio.—Tac. *Ann.* iii. 18. 3: atque idem cum Valerius Messalinus signum aureum in aede Martis Ultoris, Caecina Severus aram Ultioni (so the best manuscripts, not Ultionis) statuendam censuissent, prohibuit, ob externas ea victorias sacrari dictitans domestica mala tristitia operienda (20 A. D.). The dative case and the word sacrari seem to indicate a degree of worship, and no doubt on this altar sacrifices would have been made. Out of this beginning another imperial cult with a regular temple might have developed, had the emperor not interfered. As Wissowa points out (*R.-K.*, p. 48, n. 3), it is a good example of the separation of an abstract deity from an anthropomorphic god.

DOUBTFUL EXAMPLES

Under this head I have grouped a number of heterogeneous abstracts for which the evidence is very dubious. They are literary personifications on the border-line of deification, abstractions used

as periphrases for other gods, or singular cases with obscure evidence insufficient to establish a probability.

ADVENTUS.—*CIL.* VI. 795: Adventui Aug. feliciter, Victoriis Aug. feliciter. This is not the reading given by the *Corpus,* which substitutes Eventui for Adventui and in the footnote gives the latter as the traditional reading. The inscription is grouped with the regular sacred tituli. Following this conjecture, writers have considered this an inscription to the god Eventus Augustus (e. g., Wissowa *R.-K.*, p. 216, n. 2); Ruggiero *Diz.* I, p. 927), but it is more probably an acclamatio on the occasion of an emperor's return to Rome, meaning: "Hurrah for the arrival of the emperor! Hurrah for the victories of the emperor!" Outside of coins, where it appears as early as the reign of Trajan, the name does not appear, except possibly as a cognomen of Jupiter (III. 6340; see note).

CONSTANTIA.—Found on coins only. Peter, in Roscher, considers this a deification by analogy of others. So apparently do Preller and Wissowa.

CUPIDO.—Cupido is a literary personification, a translation of the Greek Ἔρως of Hesiod. He never received true worship among the people, and outside of literature is rarely found except in statues and scenes upon mirrors, etc.; e. g. *CIL.* I. 58. However, one case exists—a curious inscription from Spain (II. 2407), in which he is grouped with all the main divinities and his name, like theirs, is in the dative. In Plautus and other early literature we find a single Cupid, but the Alexandrine conception of many Cupids occurs often in later times.

CURA.—A certain clay cup like those described in Ritschl's *Exempla,* Tab. X., long ago lost, was said to have the legend Coerae pocolo. Mommsen (*CIL.* I. 45) suspected its genuineness because of the omission of m in pocolo, but this objection was set aside by a parallel omission in the phrase Vestae pocolo on a fragment found at Lanuvium (*Notizie* 1895, p. 45). Wilmanns (*Eph. Epig.* I, no. 6) cited a picture of a cup, found by Zangemeister, among the additions to a list of antiquities published in 1708, which was inscribed: COTRA POCOVO. This inscription he identified with ours, and is supported in this identification by Dessau op. cit. II. 2960. But the one inscription reads Cotra and the other Coerae. Great doubt exists as to the meaning, but if it is equivalent to Cura, the meaning is more likely the same as that of Horace's "atra Cura," rather than synonymous with Mens, as Jordan (*Ann. Inst.*

LIBRARY OF THE

Arch. 1884, p. 15) understood it. Hyginus (ccxx ed. Schmidt) preserved a fable in early Latin poetry of Cura and Iovis, Tellus and Saturnus, disputing over the name of a man whom Cura had made out of clay. This myth was doubtless Greek.

FATUS, FATUM.—Fatum was not a deity among the Romans, but the plural Fata were simply a translation of the Greek Moirae, and became not only a Latin literary concept, but a part of religious belief, and frequently were given inscriptions and statues. (Peter, in Roscher I, p. 1447; Wissowa *R.-K.*, p. 213, n. 4; p. 214, n. 1.)

As to Fatus, which is common in the carmina sepulchralia, this is much more probably a grammatical variant for fatum, as Wissowa holds, than an anthropomorphic conception like a genius, as Jordan (*Hermes* VII. 197) and Peter (loc. cit.) thought. This is strikingly illustrated by comparing two examples of the same stereotyped epitaph: VI. 4379, noli dolere, amica, eventum meum properavit aetas: hoc dedit fat*us* mihi, and VI. 8023, nolite dolere eventum meum, properavit aetas; hoc dedit fat*um* mihi.

But we meet with Fati and Fatae upon inscriptions from Gaul whose meaning is obscure. They may be provincial and foreign deities translated into the nearest Latin equivalents (Wissowa *R.-K.*, p. 214).

HILARITAS.—This is found only on coins of a few emperors beginning with Hadrian. Dressel (*CIL.* XIV. 192–96) identifies a figure on brick stamps of the age of Severus as Hilaritas. But the conjecture by Steuding (Roscher I, p. 2659) that Hilare in *CIL.* III. 1680 (= 8248) is Hila(ritati) Re(ginae) is very improbable, because, as 8248 shows, the words in this inscription are widely spaced, but Hilare is run together into one word.

LAETITIA.—Eckhel (*DNU.* VII, p. 21) conjectures a public cult from a coin of Commodus reading P. D. S. P. Q. R. Laetitiae C. V. S. C. = Senatus Populusque Romanus Laetitiae Coronam Vovit, Senatus Consulto; cf. Drexler in Roscher.

LUBENTIA.—Plaut. *Asin.* 268: Ut ego illos lubentiores faciam quam Lubentiast. Peter, in Roscher II. 201 f., hazards the guess that Lubentia is the same as Lubentina, just as Paventia and Paventina are synonymous. He, however, wrongly cites Hübrich *De diis Plautinis* as treating her among deities. On the contrary, Hübrich distinctly says (p. 55) it is a fictitious deity, "quales saepe poeta finxit deas." He argues simply that Lubentia was not a cognomen of Venus. With him I am inclined to agree.

MAIESTAS.—In two inscriptions (VI. 254; III. 449) occurs the phrase Genio ac Maiestati with the names of Antoninus Pius and Diocletian. Similarly Numini Maiestatique is used of Constantine (VIII. 12062, 12063). Here it is evident that Maiestas is a circumlocution for the emperor himself. The genealogy of Ovid (*Fasti* v. 25), which represents Maiestas as the daughter of Honor and Reverentia, is purely poetic.

MEMORIA.—That this conception was ever embodied as a goddess is very uncertain. There is absolutely no evidence for an official or private cult in Rome, and the name does not appear on coins till the very late Empire (see Cohen VIII, Index). On the other hand, Arnobius (295 A. D.) clearly conceived of her as a deity, including her in the list of characteristic deified abstracts: nihil horum [i. e., abstracts] sentimus et cernimus habere vim numinis neque in aliqua contineri sui generis forma, sed esse virtutem viri, salutem salvi, honorem honorati, victoris victoriam, concordis concordiam, pietatem pii, *memoriam* memoris, feliciter vero viventis ac sine ullis offensionibus felicitatem (Arn. iv. 2).

All these qualities had well-known public cults in Rome, and hence memoria is not introduced merely as a mental concept, but as one that had been deified. But though Arnobius went back through Labeo to Varro or Verrius Flaccus, possibly (cf. Teuffel-Schwabe, §396, 2; *Jahrb. f. Phil.* XXIV, p. 123), for his source, it may well be that in this list a Greek deity has crept in, since Arnobius attacked both Latin and Greek religions. In another passage (iii. 37), Musas Mnaseas est auctor filias esse Telluris et Caeli, Iovis ceteri praedicant ex Memoria uxore vel Mente, Memoria is the translation of the Greek Μνημοσύνη; cf. ii. 70; iii. 37. Servius *Ad Aen.* iii. 607 says: physici dicunt esse consecratas numinibus singulas corporis partes, ut aurem Memoriae . . . . ; frontem Genio, unde venerantes deum tangimus frontem: dextram Fidei . . . . ; genua Misericordiae: unde haec tangunt rogantes. The commentator is confusing Greek with Roman, as is clear from the mention of Misericordia = Ἔλεος who had an altar in Athens, but none in Rome.

Héron de Villefosse (*Comptes-rendus des séances,* p. ix; Cagnat *L'ann. épig.* 1899, no. 47) proposes to restore an inscription from Carthage as follows: S(aturno) A(ugusto) s(acrum) Q. Fabius Sat(urninus) sacer(dos) Martis, tem(enorus) aed(is) Memo-(riae) et Fortunula coiux eius cum filis suis votum solvit. The use

of temenorus (τεμενοῦρος Kaibel, *Epig. Gr.*, no. 781, l. 11: τεμενῶρον, τεμένους φύλακα, Hesychius) as a Latin word is unsupported, and hence is a mere conjecture.

In another inscription from Africa near Tunis (*Bulletin de la Société nationale des Antiquaires de France* 1903; *L'ann. épig.* 1904, no. 83), dated 161–69 A. D., we read: pro salute Imp. Caes. M. Aureli Antonini . . . . statuas [me]mo[r]iae temporum quattuor decreto decurionum p[osu]it, item dedicationis die epulum decurionibus dedit. The index to *L'ann. épig.* loc. cit. includes Memoria as a deity, but it is not clear whether "memoriae" is dative or genitive. If the former, memoriae = pro memoria; if the latter, it is personified, but this is not conclusive evidence of worship. On the whole, therefore, stronger proof must be adduced before admitting the deification of this idea with either public or private cult.

However, there is abundant evidence to show that the quality of memory was revered and almost sacred, especially as applied to the memory of deceased friends. Numerous inscriptions have Memoriae sacrum (VI. 23057, 17398), Bonae Memoriae (III. 7436; XI. 81), in place of Dis Manibus (and some with it, e. g., XI. 1097), followed by the genitive and often by the dative. It may be conjectured that, like the Di Manes, the memory of the departed may have been thought of as a spirit guarding his existence in the minds and hearts of his friends. The closeness with which the quality memoria approaches the deity Memoria is seen in the connection with other deities; e. g., VI. 10958, Deanae et Memoriae Aeliae Proculae; VI. 15594, Fortunae Spei Veneri et Memoriae Claud(iae) Semnes sacrum.

Moles Martis.—Aulus Gellius (xiii. 23. 2) mentions certain peculiar names written in the books of the public priests as follows: Luam Saturni, Salaciam Neptuni, Horam Quirini, Virites Quirini, Maiam Volcani, Heriem Iunonis, Moles Martis, Nerienemque Martis. Mommsen (*Hermes* XVII, p. 637) suggested that the powers of Mars may be here personified. The Feriale Cumanum (*CIL.* I². 229) records a supplicatio to them for May 12, the anniversary of the temple of Mars.

Mors.—It is extremely doubtful if the Romans ever worshiped a goddess Mors, for when Servius (*Ad Aen.* xi. 197) says Morti ipsi, deae, he is relying on the poetical lines of Statius (*Theb.* iv. 528) and Lucan (vi. 600); the words of Tertullian (*Ad nat.* ii. 15), et ipsius mortis dea est, may be referring to the spirit Morta in the Indigitamenta (see above). Moreover, the carmina sepulchralia in

which Mors occurs so frequently (see the complete collection by Peter in Roscher II. 3220) are very figurative. Of course, it is quite possible that individuals conceived of death itself as a spirit quite distinct from Dis, Orcus, or Pluto. Plautus (*Cist.* 639; *Bacch.* 1152; *Capt.* 692) merely personified death.

LETUS, too, which occurs in an epitaph (VI. 19007), quam mortis acerbus eripuit Letus teneramque ad Tartara duxit, is poetical, the change in gender from the neuter Letum being a part of the vividness of the personification or merely a grammatical variant of vulgar Latin. Cf. Fatus.

NATURA.—*L'ann. épig.* 1899, no. 77: Naturae dei Prudens Primi Antoni Rufi p. p. vil. vic. This is, of course, a periphrasis equivalent to deo. Natura, however, is frequently personified by Statius and Claudianus.

BONUM NEGOTIUM.—From the fragmentary inscription (*Eph. Epig.* V. 916), ... ivii . . . . egotivm C. Clodius C. f. Surus Diem Bonum, Mommsen conjectured Bonum Negotium and compared it with Bonus Eventus. It is more probably an acclamation.

PALLOR and PAVOR.—These personifications were long believed to have had an ancient cult dating from the reign of Tullus Hostilius, who, the legend ran, vowed them in the battle against Fidenae (Liv. i. 27. 7: Tullus in re trepida duodecim vovit Salios fanaque Pallori ac Pavori). This, however, is our only source, for it has long been shown that all references to these deities follow Livy in time, and probably were taken directly from him. The supposed images of the gods on coins of L. Hostilius Sasenna (Babelon I, pp. 52 f.) are more probably figures of a Gallic man and woman. Moreover, the fact that Cicero does not refer to these deities in any of the several passages where he speaks of evil gods has some weight as negative evidence. We are therefore justified in believing that Livy's account was based on a tradition which was perhaps handed down by the annalists and was due to a mere personification in some early poetical account of the battle (written by Ennius, Wissowa suggests) which was misunderstood as an actual deification. See Wissowa in Roscher for full references.

PROSPERITAS DEORUM.—*CIL.* III. 4557: Deorum prosperitati G. Mar(cus) Marcianus decurio . . . . s(olvit) l(ibens) l(aetus) m(erito). Deorum prosperitati=dis pro prosperitate eorum.

RITUS.—The letters RIT on a mirror beside the figure of a sitting youth to whom Vi(c)toria is speaking together with Venus and

Cupido were conjectured by Mommsen (*CIL.* I. 58; XIV. 4096) to stand for Ritus = Θεσμος, a nuptial divinity.

SANCTITAS.—*CIL.* XII. 2981: Sanctitati Iovis et Augusti sacrum Lucilius Cesti; III. 3292: sacrum dis magnis maioribus et sanctissimae sanctitati. In the first example sanctitati Iovis = sanctis Iovi et Augusto; in the second, the word eorum is probably to be supplied. The editor of the *Corpus,* however, capitalizes and indexes Sanctitas as a deity.

SORS.—*CIL.* X. 6303: Dominae Isidi Flavia Marcellin(a) Sortis signum Menphiticum cum collari argenteo p(osuit) d(e)dicavitque) l(oco) d(ato) d(ecurionum) d(ecreto). See also Mart. Capella i. 88, where Sors is made equivalent to Nemesis. Pliny (*N. H.* ii. 7. 22) says: adeoque obnoxiae sumus sortis, ut sors ipsa pro deo sit, qua deus probatur incertus. See also image on coin (69 B. C.; Babelon II, p. 315).

AUREA TEMPORA.—*CIL.* VIII. 18328: Aureis temporibus ddd nnn. Gratiani Valentiniani et Theodosi perpetuorum et divinorum, etc. Here aureis temporibus is probably ablative of time.

VERECUNDIA.—*CIL.* XIV. 1792: Iunoni et Verecundiae Ulpiae Compses q(uae) v(ixit), etc. Apparently the father who set this up conceived of a spirit protecting the maidenly modesty of his little child. Cf. Wilmanns *Exempla* 237.

VIS.—Ausonius, in a poem enumerating some of the gods, says (xi. 8. 4), et soror et coniunx fratris, regina deum, Vis, apparently personifying the idea of vis caelestrum, vis superum (Verg. *Aen.* vii. 432; i. 4) and making her equivalent to Juno, from a misunderstanding of the following passages: vii. 428, ipsa palam fari omnipotens Saturnia iussit; 432, caelestum vis magna iubet; i. 4, vi superum saevae memorem Iunonis ob iram. Hyginus (11, 20 ed. Schmidt), represents Vis, Victoria, Invidia, and Potestas as daughters of Pallas and Styx.

An altar at Aquileia has the dedication: Vi divinae sacrum (V. 837). This, however, probably refers to the taurobolium offered to Magna Mater (cf. viribus aeterni taurobolio, V. 6961, 6962; vires excepit, XIII. 1751; vires tauri, XIII. 522, 525); or to Belenus, a god of the healing springs in Aquileia (V. 754, 755). The medicinal powers of mineral springs were also deified; e. g.: XI. 1162, Nymphis et Viribus Augusti; V. 8248, Viribus Aug.; V. 5648, Lymfis Virib(us).

VITULA.—Macrobius iii. 2. 13: Hyllus [Hyginus (?), note by

Mommsen to *CIL.* I, p. 26] libro quem de dis composuit, ait Vitulam vocari deam, quae laetitiae praeest: Piso ait Vitulam Victoriam nominari, cuius rei hoc argumentum profert, quod postridie Nonas Iulias re bene gesta, cum pridie populus a Tuscis in fugam versus sit . . . . post victoriam certis sacrificiis fiat vitulatio. It is open to doubt whether this passage was any more than a mistaken reading of earlier literature predicated from the uncommon word vitulatio. The identifications with Victoria and Vitellia are certainly wrong. Cf. Baudrillart op. cit., pp. 44 ff.; Jordan in Preller I, p. 407, n. 3. Hyginus, moreover, is hardly to be depended upon for accuracy.

Voluptas.—Cicero *De nat. deor.* ii. 23. 61: quarum omnium rerum [i. e., Concordia, Libertas, etc.] quia vis erat tanta ut sine deo regi non posset ipsa res deorum nomen obtinuit. Quo ex genere Cupidinis et Voluptatis et Lubentinae Veneris, vocabula consecrata sunt, vitiosarum rerum neque naturalium . . . . . No other evidence exists for this deification, and Cicero had in mind probably Volupia or a Greek goddess. Plautus (*Bacch.* 115) names Voluptas among a number of fictitious gods. Quintilian (ix. 2. 36) treats it as a rhetorical personification by Xenophon. It was common elsewhere in Latin literature; e. g., Apul. *Met.* vi. 24; Stat. *Silv.* i. 3. 9; Claudian. x. 82; cf. *CIL.* XI. 6565.

PART II. THE DEIFIED ABSTRACTS AS A CLASS

I. THEIR ORIGIN

Having looked over the individual abstractions which were hypostatized as gods, we may now turn to more general questions touching the whole class. One of the first to be suggested, namely the origin, is also one of the most complex and difficult questions, and has given rise to great diversity of opinion. It is really involved in the broader question of the origin of the whole Roman religious system. However, with a metaphysical and philosophical investigation of the basis of this system we are not primarily concerned. The relation of our class of deities to this religion is the chief question. Were they (1) an inherent and essential part of the oldest Roman belief; or (2) a later internal development out of an earlier stage; or (3) an external addition to, or parasitic growth upon, the original system?

Of these three alternatives we may at once dismiss the third. It has not been maintained by any investigator, so far as I know. These divinities appear long before the period of Greek influence, and while the neighbors of the Romans had abstract gods who were adopted by them—Fortuna for example—yet there is no evidence to indicate that any one or all of them brought about the genesis of this class of deities. One of the very earliest cults, Concordia, was certainly native.

For the two other theories there have been spokesmen. Mommsen held the first—namely, that the conception of such deities was an essential part of the ancient Roman religion. He says: (*Römische Geschichte,* p. 223, English translation):

> Abstraction and personification lay at the root of the Roman as well as of the Hellenic mythology: the Hellenic as well as the Roman god was originally suggested by some natural phenomenon or some mental conception and to the Roman just as to the Greek every divinity appeared a person. . . . . But while abstraction, which lies at the foundation of every religion, elsewhere endeavored to rise to wider and more enlarged conceptions and to penetrate ever more deeply into the essence of things, the forms of the Roman faith remained at, or sank to, a singularly low level of conception and insight. While in the case of the Greek every important notion speedily expanded into a group of forms and gathered around it a circle of legends

and ideas, in the case of the Roman the fundamental thought remained stationary in its original naked rigidity.

Again (pp. 52 ff.) he says:

> Throughout the whole of nature, he adored the spiritual and the universal. To everything existing, to the man and the tree, to the state and the storeroom, was assigned a spirit which came into being with it and perished along with it, the counterpart of the natural phenomenon in the spiritual domain. . . . . The larger the sphere embraced in the abstraction, the higher rose the god and the reverence paid by man. Thus Jupiter and Juno are the abstractions of manhood and womanhood: Dea Dia or Ceres, the creative power; Minerva, the power of memory; Dea Bona . . . . the good deity.

Mommsen, it is clear, drew no line between the spiritualization of concrete and abstract concepts.

Boissier (*La religion romaine d'Auguste aux Antonins,* pp. 8 f.) is more explicit. Speaking of the tendency of the Romans to create numina, whenever the divinity appeared to be revealed in a new way, he says:

> Ces dieux qu'il crée ainsi à tout moment ne sont en réalité que des actes divins; et voilà pourquoi ils sont si nombreux . . . . . C'est aussi la raison qui donna aux Romains plus qu'à toutes les autres nations de l'antiquité le goût des abstractions divinisées. Comme en réalité tous leurs dieux, même les plus grands, ne sont que des qualités ou des attributs divins, et qu'ils ont toujours un peu conservé leur caractère abstrait, il n'est pas surprenant qu'on ait pris vite l'habitude d'introduire de simples abstractions dans leur compagnie. C'est un usage qui ne s'établit ordinairement dans les religions que lorsqu'elles sont vieilles; nous le trouvons à Rome dés les temps les plus reculés. . . . . Le polythéisme s'était formé chez eux par voie d'analyse abstraite . . . . et jusqu'à la fin ils ont mis dans le ciel plutôt des abstractions que des êtres vivants.

On the other hand, later writers have held that at the outset there was no general tendency to spiritualize purely mental concepts, but that they were a later development from the simple worship of a comparatively few visible concrete objects of nature. In the course of time certain epithets expressing qualities and virtues became attached to these hypostatized objects, and became important, inasmuch as they expressed a certain side or function of the god's activity, which appealed to certain worshipers in contrast to other sides and functions; e. g., Jupiter Liber in contrast to Jupiter Lucetius, Jupiter Terminus, and so on. As the epithets became

the distinguishing feature and the real basis of the worship, the qualities expressed by them assumed a growing importance, so that they overshadowed the deities to whom they were applied, became independent, and finally lost all connection with the simple concrete objects of worship.

This theory may be seen in perhaps its most extreme form in Marquardt *Römische Staatsverwaltung* III², pp. 19 f. In giving an explanation of the vast numbers of apparently independent special deities of the Indigitamenta, he says (p. 20):

> Es traten aber noch drei verschiedene Gründe hinzu, welche die Trennung der ursprünglich in geringer Anzahl vorhandenen göttlichen Wesen ins Unbegrenzte hin und das Unklarwerden der alten Gottheiten bewirkten. . . . . Zweitens waren die Qualitätsbestimmungen der Indigitamenta nicht formell erkennbare Epitheta, welche unmittelbar das Bewusstsein hatten erhalten müssen, dass sie einem bestimmten Gotte angehörten, sondern grossentheils Nomina selbständiger Form und Bedeutung, die, wie wir bereits bemerkten, sich auch der geschlechtlichen Form nach nicht immer dem eigentlichen Namen des Gottes anschlossen, woraus allein die an sich auffallende Erscheinung sich erklärt, dass die Römer eine Menge von Abstraktionen unter ihren Gottheiten haben, deren reale Verehrung als persönliche Wesen uns schwer begreiflich ist, wie Aequitas Aeternitas . . . . und viele andere. Es gab einen Iupiter Libertas, einen Iupiter Iuventus, einen Iupiter Fulgur, einen Iupiter Pecunia, einen Iupiter Lapis . . . . so dass wenigstens bei ältern Abstraktionen dieser Art, Febris Fides, Terminus, Pax und andern ebenfalls eine Zusammengehörigkeit mit persönlichen Gottheiten anzunehmen gerechtfertigt sein dürfte.

The position of Preller is not certain. He classified our abstracts (op. cit. II², p. 178) as owing their cults more to abstraction and to demonic belief than to the older polytheism of nature-worship. However, in the spirits of the Indigitamenta of the earliest period he recognized "reflection" and "abstraction" as the genesis. On the other hand, as we have seen above (e. g., under Concordia), he derived many of our abstract deifications from the more personal gods and goddesses.

In the latest complete work on Roman religion, the exceedingly accurate and careful book by Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer,* so often refered to above, that eminent scholar has taken up and reinforced the doctrine of the separation of our deities from parent gods, without stating the theory so broadly and absolutely as Marquardt. He cannot see the slightest trace in the earliest

stage either of the deification of powers of nature or of the embodiment of ethical ideas. On p. 20 he says:

> Ebensowenig aber sind es ethische Ideen, die in den Göttern verkörpert sind: die grosse Zahl von Abstraktionen, von göttlich personifizierten Eigenschaften, die wir in späteren Perioden der religiösen Entwicklung in Rom antreffen und als characterisch für die römische Denkweise anzunehmen gewöhnt sind, fehlt hier noch vollständig.

Cf. *Gesam. Abhandl.*, p. 304. He thinks that in the fact that many epithets became detached from and independent of the names of the originally few principal deities, and that such deities as Jupiter Victor and Victoria (p. 48), Mars and Bellona, stood side by side, the personal patrons of victory and war on the one side, and the representatives of the quality or property itself on the other, is to be seen the starting-point of the free deification of *virtutes* and *utilitates* which rapidly followed—of Concordia, Spes, Pudicitia, Pietas, for example. See also Carter *De deor. Rom. cogn.*, p. 34.

These quotations suffice to outline the second theory indicated above. It denies to the earliest Romans the power or tendency to spiritualize or hypostatize a purely mental concept. Whereas Mommsen made Jupiter an elevated conception of manhood, to Wissowa he is nothing but the sky-god, and the religious ideas of that period reflect the interests of a community engaged in agriculture and stock-raising, in hard work and endless battles (*R.-K.*, p. 20). Hence qualities, states, and other like ideas belong to a later date and are a later development.

My own conviction is that the truth is midway between these two opposing theories. It may be granted at the outset that the earliest stage of the Romans was that of an agricultural people, often in conflict with neighboring tribes, and that therefore any elevated ethical concept would not be expected of them and is not discernible in our earliest records. This, however, is not to say that they had only the power or habit of spiritualizing the purely concrete and visible object or act. To do so would be to deny them the power of thought.[23] The sources for the history of the ancient

[23] On the contrary, Professor M. Bloomfield says: "They [i. e., symbolic deities] are primitive, and the state of mind needed to form them is absolutely that of the natural man. They are not 'secondary,' for they are as common in Homer, Hesiod, the Vedas, as in modern poets. . . . . Any quality, however abtract it may seem to us, presents itself to natural man as something solipsistic; it is a thing per se." He cites parallels from Sanskrit literature (*Studies in*

times, fragmentary as they are, indicate to some extent that they did thus deify thoughts. It is true that in our surest and most authentic record of the past, the list of festivals on the ancient stone-calendars, we see for the most part nothing but material objects deified. But even here there is a goddess Ops, who represents a quality or condition wished for, restricted, however, to a particular sphere. For ops does not mean "harvest" or "grain," but the "fulness" or "abundance of grain."[24] (Cf. *Lat. Etym. Wörterb.*, ed. A. Walde, Lieferung 6.)

It is unfortunate for our correct conception of this early stage of religion that the tradition of the Indigitamenta has been so indirect that it is a matter of great doubt, first, whether the "minuti dei" therein contained were really independent gods or epithets to be used in addressing the great gods; and, second, whether any of them actually belonged to the earliest period. They cannot be used as evidence for the origin of the deities under discussion, but in passing we may note that several of them contain the germs of abstraction of quality, condition, or virtue, though restricted to single spheres of the life of children or married persons (cf. p. 45).

But there is more positive evidence of the tendency to deify mental concepts in the earliest period when the Romans were farmers only, even if it is circumscribed in sphere, for Varro (*De re rustica* i. 1. 6) says among illos duodecim deos, qui maxime agricolarum duces sunt, he prays to Lympham ac Bonum Eventum, quoniam sine aqua omnis arida ac misera agricultura, sine successu ac bono eventu frustratio est. (Cf. Wissowa under Bonus Eventus in Roscher.) Evidently bono eventu completes and fills out the abstract successu. The age of this god is attested by the others in the list that are represented by festivals on the calendars or are otherwise known to be ancient.[25]

Honor of Gildersleeve, pp. 37 ff., especially pp. 41 f.). For similar abstract conceptions among North American Indians and Polynesians, see the *Monist* XVI, 3 (July, 1906), pp. 357 ff., "The Fundamental Concept of Primitive Philosophy," by A. O. Lovejoy.

[24] Copia is co-opia, not materially different from ops; fructus would be the natural word for "crops," if that were the fundamental idea personified. In Roscher III, p. 931, Wissowa himself says: "Sie [Ops] ist eine Verkörpferung der reichen *Fülle* des Erntesegens und darum im Kulte mit dem Erntegotte Consus verbunden."

[25] Domaszewski (*West. Zeitsch.* XXIV, n. 16) thinks this circle of deities is an invention of Varro. It is possible that the formation of a circle of these

We have seen that the direct evidence, incomplete as it is, tends to show that as far back as the agricultural stage of the Romans they deified res expetendae. This conclusion, it seems to me, is strongly supported by the same tendency seen in outside neighboring peoples. The Sabines worshiped a goddess of welfare, Salus, and possibly one of victory in Vacuna; the Umbrian town of Ocriculum had a cult of Valentia; and the Latins themselves, of whom the Romans were but a hill-tribe, worshiped Fors Fortuna, who came into the Roman religion in prehistoric times. Furthermore, the most ancient private Latin inscriptions on cups, mirrors, and the like, dating at least from 350–200 B. C., show a number of independent abstracts—e. g., Aecetiai pocolom (I. 43), Fortunai (I. 49), Fide (XI. 6291), Salute (XI. 6295)—which point to an old and well-established habit of giving presents to these abstractions.

The natural interpretation, it seems to me, to place upon these facts is that the habit of personifying and deifying a quality or condition independently of other gods was inherent in the Roman character. On the other hand, it cannot be doubted that some of our abstracts—e. g., Iuventas, Libertas, perhaps Fides—were derived from epithets by which the major deities were called, but it is by no means sure that in these cases we may see the entire cause, as Marquardt believed, nor the starting-point, as Wissowa appears to think, for this style of deification. It is, however, so sure and convincing a cause in a few instances that it has been seized upon as a satisfactory explanation for them all, and nearly all the writers on the subject apparently go on the principle: Given a deified appellative, find its original personal or concrete parent. Consequently, the most trivial and insignificant details have been magnified to find a nexus for almost every abstract with one of the twelve gods. The extent to which this "split-off" theory has gone is well illustrated by the attempt of Amatucci (*Riv. di. stor. ant.* N. S. VII, p. 26) to derive Pietas from Aeneas, the Pater Indiges. If, he argues, as Preller thinks, Fides came from Jupiter, Concordia from Venus, Pudicitia from Juno, and Mens from Fortuna, Pietas may well come from pius Aeneas. But the attempt to see in Spes a con-

gods with a fixed number and in pairs was a literary device of the author, but without doubt the deities he cited were generally recognized as those most worshiped by the farmers. Otherwise his invocation would have lost greatly in effectiveness.

nection with Venus and to limit her in origin to the department of agriculture from a line of Tibullus is almost as striking. (See above, p. 18; Preller II, p. 253.)

This theory has been used too freely in many cases, and even in some instances regarded as most certain there is room for doubt. The connection between Jupiter and Fides, for example, commonly considered a typical illustration, rests upon the participation of the three chief and oldest flamens (see above, p. 20) annually in her worship. But this may demonstrate only the importance of the cult. It can well be imagined that the idea of the political faith of the state was so important and so carefully guarded that the chief religious magistrates of the state should be in charge of it. As to the proximity of her temple to that of Zeus, other temples were also adjacent, and the prestige of the goddess may have controlled the choice of its site on the Capitoline, quite apart from any idea of an organic connection with the cult of the great god of the sky. As to the ancient cult of Dius Fidius on the Quirinal (466 B. C.), the natalis of this temple was on June 5—a day not sacred to Jupiter, as far as we can determine. Moreover, plastic art represented him after the archaic type of Apollo (Wissowa *R.-K.*, p. 122), whereas we should expect the type of Ζεύς πίστιος or Ζεύς ὅρκιος.

This leads to a consideration of the value of the various evidences for an original connection. The oldest and most certain evidence is the similarity in the dates of festivals, temple foundations, and annual offerings. As all the Ides were consecrated to Jupiter, and all the Kalends to Juno, there is ground for belief in some relationship between a deity and one of these gods, if a natalis of its temple falls on the days sacred to Jupiter or Juno. Yet the validity of this proof is diminished by the fact that some temples on being restored were given a different natalis. Furthermore, sometimes it is mere coincidence. We are not to think of a connection in cult between Juno Moneta and the Tempestates because their anniversaries were both June 1. Nor was there any connection between Venus and the rustic festival of Vinalia, though both were celebrated on August 19, or between Jupiter and Honos et Virtus because the former's feriae and the latter's natalis fell on the Ides of July.

The case is similar with contemporaneous reception into the state-cult. The founding of two temples on the same day of the same year may show some bond between the two cults, but not

necessarily a vital one. Compare the founding of Mens and Venus Erycina on the Capitol on the same date. Proximity in space affords some sign of a nexus, but it is dangerous to use; for while two shrines or temples closely united indicate similarities and relationships in the minds of the founders, it is always possible that considerations of the best site, the best appearance, and the exigencies of ground, convenience, and so forth, which often determine the location of temples, would throw two wholly unrelated cults into close proximity. Even in the early period of Rome it would have been natural to crowd temples and shrines upon the Capitoline as an imposing site, and to group them together for convenience. So on the same height with Jupiter Optimus Maximus dwelt Fides (254), Ops (293–218?), Mens, Venus Erycina, and others. It would be absurd to infer that, because the temple of Pietas was built in the Forum Holitorium, therefore she was a deity of the garden and an offshoot from Venus, the garden-goddess.

Other evidence consists in similarity of ritual and collocation in sacred formulae (which, however, is almost entirely lacking in the case of deified abstracts), inscriptional juxtapositions, and peculiarities of representation on statues, bas-reliefs, and coins, which latter group is extensive, but often quite doubtful.

The considerations suggested suffice to show the extreme difficulty in using evidence so untrustworthy and inadequate. Only an accumulation of considerations deduced from these different fields is sufficient to associate one deification with another, or with a special phase of activity and life; and even then great probability only is attained. It is therefore better in a majority of cases to shrink from any close identification. For it is not necessary to prove, or even to assume, that one abstract deity was an offshoot of another; on the contrary, it should not be admitted except on strong evidence, for the deification of virtues and ethical conceptions is simply a developed stage of the religious bent of the earliest Roman. Granted that he was a polytheist or polydaemonist, it follows that there were beyond all doubt relations, situations, and utilities as omnipresent and desirable as the tangible objects about him. Victory in battle, success of his crops, abundance of harvested produce, and some other simple ideas are as naturally hypostatized and worshiped for their beneficient assistance, as war (Bellona) itself, the fountain (Fons), or the harbor (Portunus). To posit a stage when they could only spiritualize visible concrete objects (cf.

Wissowa *Gesam. Abhandl.*, p. 326) is to deny any mental activity and to go far back into a prehistoric stage of evolution. To be sure, the primitive Roman citizen had simple conceptions for his gods, and they were related closely to the activities of life and nature with which he was familiar—a characteristic feature of their entire history. But, as the nation grew in size and political power, their deified concepts grew broader, though always with a utilitarian tendency.

In short, I hold, first, that the tendency to deify purely mental concepts—that is, to consider them external supernatural forces, to make numina of them—was indigenous to the native Romans, restricted it is true, but nevertheless existing, and possessed by them in common with the other Italic peoples and by the Greeks as well, as a heritage from the Indo-Germanic stock—a tendency which the Greeks, with livelier imaginative powers, carried farther by incorporating their concepts in human personal form; secondly, that the process of differentiation from an earlier deity accounted, like foreign influence, for the existence of several deities, but that it is unnecessary to assume it as the origin of the whole class of deified abstracts or for many of them. It simply acted as an additional impulse toward the spread of that type of deification.

II. THE DEIFIED ABSTRACTS IN LITERATURE

We come now to a second question, namely, the importance and place of our class of divinities in the Roman religion and the attitude of the people toward them. As this attitude would likely vary with different periods of the state, it is necessary to examine historically as far as possible the various kinds of literary and inscriptional evidence. Since the former is the more direct testimony, we may review it first; but it must be dealt with cautiously, for it is very uneven. Serious descriptive or didactic prose may be received as positive opinion, but the credibility of poetry and imaginative and rhetorical prose is very insecure, since usually fact and fiction are confused and blended. A common abstract noun is often confused with personification, and personification with deification, as the boundaries between these theoretically distinct provinces are slight and vague. It is impossible to give an all-inclusive, all-exclusive definition of personification, because it is impossible to define personality. There is a large number of verbs, adjectives, and other words applicable both to persons and things,

and so loosely are some of our most common terms employed that we could scarcely find agreement between any two authorities on a list of words applicable to a quality, but not to a person. Witness the common variation in different texts in the use of capitals in passages containing abstracts. What is vivid imagination to one person is a mere common noun to another. Should the nouns in the following sententia by Publilius Syrus (Ribbeck *Fragmenta* II. 1. 641, 646, 647) be capitalized:[26] virtuti melius quam fortunae creditur?

The step from personification to deification is equally short. As has been noticed above, since deification is simply the reverence of certain rare and important qualities as external forces, much like the "ideas" of Plato, the cycle of the deified qualities will vary with different minds. All deifications, too, are personifications, but the reverse statement is not true. It is, therefore, impossible dogmatically to determine whether a personified abstraction is also a deity in the author's mind. When Horace (*Carm.* i. 35) invoked Fortuna, the actual goddess of Antium, thus, O diva gratum, quae regis Antium, how did he conceive of Necessitas, personified as highly as Fortuna and placed in her train with Spes and Fides, recognized deities? Was he not conscious that Necessitas was not regarded as a goddess by the state or people? Did he not perceive the incongruity in placing a mere concept of the imagination in close relation with an actual deity, or did he really consider Necessitas divine? We cannot say. But for purposes of discrimination it is safer to assume, when known deities and otherwise unauthenticated deities are mentioned together in highly imaginative passages, that the former are lowered to rhetorical lay-figures rather than that the latter are exalted to actual celestial beings.[27] As for single personifications not in the company of true gods, we may disregard them altogether.[28]

[26] Cf. Martial xii. 6. 3: recta Fides, hilaris Clementia, cauta Potestas, which names are indexed by Friedländer as goddesses, but are not even capitalized by Gilbert.

[27] The most impressive illustration of a false deification originating from a poetical personification is the case of Pavor and Pallor, which deceived Livy or his sources. See above.

[27] Cf. R. Engelhard *De personificationibus, quae in poesi atque arte romanorum inveniuntur* (Göttingen, 1881), for a very complete collection. He fails, however, to draw any distinction between fact and fancy. L. Deubner, in

Keeping in mind these principles and the relative values of our literary evidence, we may proceed with our examination; while we cannot determine the actual belief of an author in individual cases, an idea of his general attitude toward this class may often be gained, as well as of the feeling of his time.

A. LITERATURE OF THE REPUBLIC

We have practically no references from literature of the third ceutury B. C. apart from PLAUTUS, except perhaps the fragment from Ennius: "O Fides alma apta pinnis ac ius iurandum Iovis." (Cic. *De off.* iii. 29. 104; Ribbeck op. cit., *Enn.* 37. 380.) This is doubtless due to its fragmentary condition, for in the writings of Plautus we see allusions and direct references to our cults in considerable quantity. It is difficult, however, to determine how far he is copying his Greek original and how far he is inserting distinctively Roman ideas. (Cf. the discussion on Fides in Hübrich op. cit., pp. 33 f.; also the citation of Libertas in *Rudens* 490, which should be read cum Hercule instead of mecum hercle, is itself probably a Greek tale; cf. Ussing ad loc.)

Yet the poet lived in a period when the canonization of appellatives by the state officials was very common, and it can be shown that nowhere does he clearly represent a purely Greek conception as a Roman divinity. Before his time Fortuna, Concordia, Salus, Victoria, Spes, Fides, and probably Ops and Libertas, had been enshrined; during his life Mens, Honos, Virtus, Iuventas, and perhaps Pietas, were created, while other temples were added to those already existing.[29]

This busy period of consecration is reflected in his plays. They frequently repeat the names of the goddesses mentioned above (except Concordia and Iuventas), especially Fortuna, Salus, and Spes, who became proverbial and evidently were popular cults among the people. Note such phrases as *Capt.* 529, Neque iam Salus servare, si volt, me potest; *Most.* 351, Nec Salus nobis saluti iam esse, si cupiat, potest; *Cist.* 742, At vos Salus servassit (cf. Ter. *Adelp.* 761); *Rud.* 231, Spes bona, obsecro, subventa mihi; ibid. 247, obsecro, amplectere, Spes mea; *Cist.* 670, Spes mihi sancta subveni;

Roscher IV. 2068 ff., has an excellent treatment of personification and also a full list of the examples in both Greek and Latin literature.

[29] Hübrich, p. 108, is wrong in personifying pax in *Trin.* 837. The usually accepted reading is tua pax.

Capt. 304, Fortuna humana fingit artatque ut lubet. These occasional lines indicate that the abstract cults were prominent factors in the period of Plautus, but we find also in his comedies touches of skeptical but kindly fun at their expense. That he was conscious of their artificiality seems apparent from the manner in which he plays upon their appellative use; e. g.: *Cist.* 644, O Salute mea salus salubrior; *Rud.* 501, Malam Fortunam in aedis te adduxi meas; *Aul.* 100, Si Bona Fortuna veniat, ne intromiseris (Staphyla) Pol ea ipsa credo intromittatur cavet, Nam ad aedis nostras nusquam adiit quaquam prope.

Examples of light and familiar treatment of these gods frequently occur, when, for instance, a character who proves of great assistance is called Spes, Salus, or Victoria, without regard to sex; thus *Merc.* 866: qui me revocat? (Eu.) Spes, Salus, Victoria; *Pseud.* 709: Dic utrum Spemne an Salutem te salutem, Pseudole. In the *Asinaria* (712 ff.) two slaves, Libanus and Leonida, are represented as the goddesses Salus and Fortuna respectively, vying for honor from their master Argyrippus. The latter declares Fortuna superior, but, on the objection of Libanus, the following colloquy ensues (ll. 718 ff.): (Arg.) licet laudem Fortunam, tamen ut ne Salutem culpem. (Phil.) ecastor ambae sunt bonae. (Arg.) sciam ubi boni quid dederint. A few lines below (727) he says: ut consuere homines Salus frustratur et Fortuna. (Cf. *Rud.* 490: Edepol, Libertas, lepida es, though this may be Greek.) It is true that the great gods too are treated very lightly, but it is hardly probable that Plautus would have gone to the length of giving the name Mars to a woman or Minerva to a man. The sex of their personality was too prominent to their worshipers.

Moreover, the abstracts are used very frequently for the purpose of etymological punning. Examples of this are among the foregoing citations; others are *Asin.* 506, Pietatem piem; *Capt.* 392, Honore honestiorem; *Merc.* 842, speratrix . . . . Spem speratam; *Cist.* 515, Ops opulenta; *Aul.* 506, fretus tua, Fides, fiducia. But Plautus does not stop with real gods; to make the pun more forceful he invents a new one, e. g., *Asin.* 267 f.:

> Ubi ego nam Libanum requiram aut familiarem filium
> ut ego lubentiores faciam quam Lubentiast?

(Cf. Naevius, Ribbeck op. cit. II, p. 31: Fortunam ipsam anteibo fortunis meis.) The point here lies in the close resemblance of

Lubentia both to Libentina and Libitina and also to Plautus' usual treatment of the actual deities. It is a subtle parody on them; as an appellative or mere personification without connotation of divinity the humorous effect would be greatly diminished. Also *Pseud.* 669, Namque ipsa Opportunitas non potuit mi opportunius advenire; *Cas.* 225, munditiis Munditiam antideo.

It seems as if the playwright had in mind the arbitrary and vague classification of such deities, and was satirizing the tendency of the times to create such cults on the inspiration of a consul or other officer. The combination, Salus, Fortuna, Lux, Laetitia, Gaudium (*Capt.* 864), is a jest at these non-personal transparent gods. A more striking case, however, is *Bacch.* 114 ff.:

(Ly.) quis istic habet?
(Pi.) Amor, Voluptas Venu', Venustas, Gaudium,
Iocu', Ludus, Sermo, Suavisuaviatio.
(Ly.) Quid tibi commercist cum dis damnosissimis?
(Pi.) Mali sunt homines qui bonis dicunt male.
tu dis nec recte dicis: non aequom facis.
(Ly.) An deus est ullus Suavisuaviatio?
(Pi.) An non putasti esse umquam? O Lyde, es barbarus,
quem ego sapere nimio censui plus quam Thalem,
is stultior es barbaro Poticio,
qui tantus natu *deorum nescis nomina.*

The picture of this old religious, upright servant in doubt whether a polysyllabic abstract word was a god or not, but not questioning the others at all, is a humorous reflection of Plautus on the limitless number of abstractions that might in time be made gods.

When the poet puts personifications on the stage in the form of characters, he of course is following the Greek custom. Inopia and Luxuria (Prolog. to *Trin.*) are pure personifications, as the description shows. Auxilium (*Cist.* 149 ff.) is a sort of burlesque on the deus ex machina. The neuter gender is foreign to deity, and the repetition of the deus in the latter case seems sarcastic; viz., satin' vix reliquit deo . . . . ego eram dicturus, *deus.*

In striking contrast to Plautus, TERENCE practically disregards the abstracts. Salus, by him identified with Hygieia and associated with Aesculapius, and Fors Fortuna are the only examples mentioned. Perhaps one cause for this silence lies in the fact that no new cults were established during the time of his composition, yet mention of the more important deities is rare, too.

Of comedy elsewhere only the line (Ribbeck II. 220), numquis me quaesiit? Bona Fortuna, concerns us, which suggests that AFRANIUS continued the device of Plautus of having the characters call themselves by the name of some transparent deity. Of the tragic fragments also we have but one touching our subject, ascribed to PACUVIUS (Ribbeck XIV. 365–75):

> Fortunam insanam esse et caecam et brutam perhibent philosophi
> saxoque instare in globoso praedicant volubiles.
> Insanam autem esse aiunt quia atrox incerta instabilisque sit,
> caecam ob eam rem esse iterant quia nil cernat quo sese adplicet;
> brutam quia dignum atque indignum nequeat internoscere;
> sunt autem alii philosophi qui contra Fortunam negant
> esse ullam sed temeritate res regi omnis autumant.
> Id magis veri simile esse usus reapse experiundo edocet
> velut Orestes modo fuit rex, factust mendicus modo.

We have here probably a poetical version of a Greek philosophical description.

The other poets of the republic, save CATULLUS, offer no passages of interests to us. But in the lines of this passionate writer to a false friend (xxx. 11 f.), Si tu oblitus es, at dii meminerunt, meminit Fides, Quae te ut paeniteat postmodo facti faciet tui, we see his strong belief in the punitive power of the dishonored goddess of faith. Less serious is lxiv. 169 f. (cf. l. 366):

> sic nimis insultans extremo tempore saeva
> fors etiam invidit questibus auris

and in lxvi. 87 there is but slight personification of Concordia.

With VARRO we reach the first direct evidence regarding the nature and position of these divinities, thanks to the detailed criticisms of Augustine on the great scholar's work on the Roman religion. What place did he give to Fortuna and her kind? According to his scheme of treatment by which he divided the cults into dii certi (book xiv), those whose cults were plain and definite, dii incerti (book xv), about whom there were uncertain traditions and explanations, and dii selecti or praecipui (book xvi), those who needed special discussion, he placed the deified qualities in the first class together with the specialized spirits of the Indigitamenta (R. Agahd *Jahrb. für class. Philol.* 1898, p. 127; Marquardt-Wissowa *Staatsverw.* III. 94). Augustine explicitly states this of three goddesses (*De civ. dei* vii. 3):

et tamen Minerva est inter selectos deos; Mentem autem deam turba vilis operuit. Quid de Virtute dicam? quid de Felicitate? de quibus in quarto libro plura iam diximus, quas cum deas haberent, nullum eis locum inter selectos deos dare voluerunt . . . . (Agahd loc. cit., p. 122).

For the others it is supported from the fact that Augustine in following Varro's argument groups them together in book iv. 11 ff.

Varro took special pains to show that the abstracts were genuine deities and not mere mental concepts, and thus explains their origin in a passage preserved in Augustine op. cit. iv. 24:

Usque adeone, inquiunt [i. e., Varro inquit; cf. Agahd, p. 22] maiores nostros insipientes fuisse credendum est, ut haec nescirent munera divina esse, non deos? Sed quoniam sciebant nemini talia nisi aliquo deo largiente concedi, quorum deorum nomina non inveniebant, earum rerum nominibus appellabant deos, quas ab eis sentiebant dari, aliquo vocabula inde flectentes sicut a bello Bellonam, nuncupaverunt, non Bellum; sicut a cunis Cuninam, non Cunam; sicut a segetibus Segetiam, non Segetem; sicut a pomis Pomonam, non Pomum; sicut a bobus Bubonam, non Bovem; aut certe nulla vocabuli declinatione sicut res ipsae nominantur, ut Pecunia dicta est dea, quae dat pecuniam, non omnino pecunia dea ipsa putata est; ita Virtus, quae dat virtutem, Honor, qui honorem, Concordia, quae concordiam, Victoria, quae dat victoriam. Ita, inquiunt, cum Felicitas dea dicitur, non ipsa quae datur sed numen illud adtenditur, a quo felicitas datur.

It is clear, therefore, that Varro differentiated these deities from the great gods by the transparent meaning of their names. They belonged to an "apothéose grammaticale," to use the happy phrase of Bouchè-Le Clercq (*Manuel des institutes romaines,* p. 493); and as Varro places none of them under his third class, dii selecti (praecipui), not even Fortuna, Victoria, or Concordia, whose cults played important parts in the history of the Romans, they occupied in his estimation a lower rank among the celestials. Gods like Janus, Jupiter, Saturn, Genius, Mercury, Apollo, Mars, and the others, were more important because they had varied functions, were more personal, had certain semi-historical biographies preserved in literature, were not transparent in their names, and were considered by the common people as their great gods.[30]

[30] If Agahd's words (p. 129), "Itaque hos deos *praecipue tractandos* selegit, unde nomen acceperunt deorum *selectorum,*" mean that the deities termed *dii selecti*, were not considered more important or in a different class from the others, but that they were classed together merely for comprehensive and thorough, special treatment, I cannot agree with him. Augustine's remarks and

However, Varro associated several of our deities with anthropomorphic gods—e. g., Janus, Liber, Saturnus, Proserpina, Minerva, Mars—in listing among the Indigitamenta those that had a narrow specific function in a special activity. Thus (August. ibid. iv. 11): ipse [Iuppiter] opem ferat nascentibus excipiendo eos sinu terrae et vocetur Opis? . . . . ipse dea Iuventas, quae post praetextam excipiat iuvenalis aetatis exordia? (iv. 21): Quid necesse erat Opi deae commendare nascentes . . . . ; deae Menti ut bonam haberent mentem, ... deae Victoriae ut vincerent, deo Honori, ut honorarentur? He gives the origin of Salus, Fortuna, Fors, and Fides as Sabine, and ascribes them to Titus Tatius.

The great Roman antiquarian also made another classification of the gods on the basis of the kinds of theology they indicated; viz., Tert. *Ad nat.* ii. 1, p. 94:

> Triplici enim genere deorum censum distinxit: unum esse physicum, quod philosophi retractant, aliud mythicum, quod inter poetas volutatur, tertium gentile [civile, August. vi. 5] quod populi sibi quique adoptaverunt;

August. iv. 27:

> Relatum est in litteras, doctissimum pontificem Scaevolam disputasse tria genera tradita deorum, unum a poetis, alterum a philosophis, tertium a principibus civitatis. Primum genus nugatorium dicit esse, quod multa de diis fingantur indigna; secundum non congruere civitatibus, quod habeat aliqua supervacua, aliqua etiam quae obsit populis nosse.

Varro and Scaevola would have called the abstracts pre-eminently the "civile genus," "a principibus civitatis cultum," and particularly adapted to the popular understanding. But in Varro's own religious belief they occupy no different position from the other gods. As a Stoic he conceived of the individual gods as parts, phases, or designations of the one great spirit permeating the universe, and from this theory he explained such forms as Jupiter Iuventas, Jupiter Pecunia, and others.

Cicero, like Varro, groups the deified qualities apart from the chief gods, and for the same reason that Varro advanced, viz., that they are named from the thing itself. With him they are a third class distinct from the celestials and demigods. He realizes that practically they are only symbolized mental concepts (*De nat. deor.* iii. 24. 61; 18. 47), and offers a hypothesis for their develop-

his characterization of them as *praecipui* must naturally have been called forth by some statement of Varro that they were distinct and superior to the others.

ment, analogous to Varro's theory, viz., that, as in course of time the gifts of certain real gods became named freely from the gods who gave them, such a close identity of deity and function was formed that it was easy to designate the divinity that granted some especially desirable thing by the name of the thing itself (*De nat. deor.* ii. 23).

Quidquid enim magnam utilitatem generi afferret humano, id non sine divina bonitate erga homines fieri arbitrabantur. Itaque tum illud, quod erat a deo natum, nomine ipsius dei nuncupabant ut cum fruges Cererem appellamus, vinum autem Liberum: ex quo illud Terenti "Sine Cerere et Libero friget Venus." Tum autem res ipsa, in qua vis inest maior aliqua sic appellatur, ut ea ipsa vis nominetur deus, ut Fides, ut Mens, quas in Capitolio dedicatas videmus proxime a M. Aemilio Scauro; ante autem ab Atilio Calatino erat Fides consecrata. Vides Virtutis templum, vides Honoris a M. Marcello renovatum. . . . . Quid Opis? quid Salutis? quid Concordiae? Libertatis? Victoriae? quarum omnium rerum, quia vis erat tanta ut sine deo regi non posset, ipsa res deorum nomen obtinuit.

He feels, however, that such deification went much too far, and even vices were considered divine, such as Cupido, Voluptas, and Lubentina Venus (loc. cit.). Even Fortuna is ever inseparable from inconstancy and temerity, which are qualities unworthy of a divine being (op. cit. iii. 24. 61). Such notions should never be given cults (*De legg.* ii. 19, earumque laudum delubra sunto neve ulla vitiorum; ii. 28, usque vetusta in Palatio Febris et altera Esquiliis Malae Fortunae detestanda atque omnia eius modi repudianda sunt; cf. *De. nat. deor.* iii. 25. 63).

Furthermore, our author divides the abstracts into virtues (*De legg.* ii. 28) and desirable conditions (res expetendae, ibid.; optandae, *De nat. deor.* iii. 61); and, while there is no essential difference in the worship of these, as Wissowa has pointed out (*R.-K.*, p. 271), yet Cicero seems to show a greater appreciation of the virtues. At any rate, it is striking that in his ideal laws enumerating the classes of gods he includes the virtues explicitly, but leaves out the desirable conditions: . . . . ast olla, propter quae datur adscensus in caelum, Mentem, Virtutem, Pietatem, Fidem (*De legg.* ii. 19). Compare the distinction (*De nat.* iii. 88): Quamvis licet Menti delubra et Virtuti et Fidei consecremus, tamen haec in nobis ipsis sita videmus, Spei, Salutis, Opis, Victoriae, facultas a dis expetenda est. Mens and Fides seem particularly favorite cults of Cicero, to judge from the frequency with which they are mentioned

in his allusions to the abstracts, and their usual position of first or second in the list (cf. *De nat.* iii. 47, 61; ii. 79).

But while Cicero gave a place to these deities in his religious system, yet he had no clear conception of their personality and thought of them as little more than notions. This attitude is betrayed by the fact that, whereas he speaks (*De legg.* ii. 19) of the gods and heroes collectively in the masculine gender, he refers to the feminine deities, Mens, etc., by the neuter plural, viz., *olla,* propter *quae* datur adscensus in caelum. Morover, like the early poets, he plays on the duality of appellation and deity; e. g., *De div.* i. 41. 87, nusquam se fortunatiorem quam Praeneste vidisse Fortunam; *In Verr.* iii. 131, quo ex iudicio te ulla Salus servare posset. See also Cotta's remarks (*De nat. deor.* iii. 61): quarum rerum utilitatem video, video etiam consecrata simulcra; quare autem in iis vis deorum insit tum intellegam cum cognovero.

Only two more references in the republican literature need detain us. They are illustrative of a skeptical attitude toward our deities. LABERIUS on the occasion of his public disgrace composed a pathetic apostrophe to Fortuna, immoderata in bono aeque atque in malo (Ribbeck II, ll. 113 ff.), and among the sententiae of his rival PUBLILIUS is one which may allude to the passage from Laberius: ex hominum questu facta Fortuna est dea (Ribbeck II, l. 153).

B. LITERATURE OF THE EARLY EMPIRE

In the literature of the Augustan age we have no discussion of the symbolic gods; nevertheless, we meet with significant allusions to them now and then. Those from TIBULLUS are colorless, yet they seem to show a true faith in our deities; e. g., iii. 3. 22, Nam Fortuna sua tempora lege regit; ii. 5. 45,

> Ecce super fessas volitat Victoria puppes,
> Tandem ad Troianos diva superba venit,

while he also plays on literal content and deity; e. g., ii. 6. 19 f., credula Spes; 1. 27:

> Spes facilem Nemesim spondet mihi, sed negat illa.
> Ei mihi, ne vincas, dura puella, deam.

The designation of his mistress by the term Nemesis recalls the Plautine phrase Pietas mea (*Curc.* 639). We cannot be sure that in the phrase Pax alma (i. 10. 45 and 67) we have more than a

very vivid personification, since the cult is not known to have been established at that time (but see p. 37).

PROPERTIUS is more skeptical, at least regarding two deities: iii. 24. 19, Mens bona, si qua dea es, tua me in sacraria condo; ii. 6. 25,

> Templa Pudicitiae quid opus statuisse puellis
> si cuivis nuptae quidlibet esse licet.

Of Fortuna he is surer (i. 6. 25): Me sine, quem semper voluit Fortuna iacere, ...

The abstract deities seem to have made little impression upon VERGIL. Only one clear allusion to the position of any of them in the state-cult is found in all his works, viz., *Aen.* i. 292, where Jupiter, sketching the future Rome to Venus, says: cana Fides et Vesta, Remo cum fratre Quirinus iura dabunt; in which an allusion to the ancient cult of Fides publica populi Romani is evident. True, he writes of Victory smiling upon war (ibid. xii. 187), of Fortune renewing faith (v. 604), of Justice, the last to leave the earth (*Geor.* ii. 474); but these, like Fama, are merely the lay-pieces of rhetoric or Greek myth, which he uses with such effort to portray scenes that he lays aside regard for the actual facts of religion. So, for example, after the reference above to the actual deities, Fides, Vesta, and Quirinus, he imagines a god Furor sitting within the temple of Janus. Compare Bellona in the train of Discordia among the real deities, Neptune, Mars, and Venus.[31]

The same habit is seen in HORACE, except that Horace often seems consciously to make a plainer reference to actual deity while aiming at rhetorical effect. Cf. Faustitas = Fausta Felicitas (*Carm.* iv. 5. 18), Iuventas = Hebe (i. 30. 7). Fortuna in *Carm.* i. 35 is partly the actual goddess of Antium, but mainly the personification of chance or fate; the Fides in her train alludes to the cult ("velata panno"), but in reality is a quality, as the adjective rara shows; and to these he adds a pure personification in Necessitas (cf. Wickham ad loc., and Kiessling ad *Carm.* i. 24. 7; compare also Pudor *Carm. saec.* 57 ff., and Veritas *Carm.* i. 24, for mixing of fact and fancy).

OVID was a great student of religion and mythology, and devoted himself to gathering up the etiological theories concerning them, often without good discrimination. In the six books of the *Fasti* he treated the festivals of the abstract gods in the same way

[31] *Geor.* ii. 425 refers only to the fact that the olive branch was used by those who sued for peace; cf. *Aen.* vii. 154.

as those of the anthropomorphic gods, and none were omitted so far as his work went. Both in this calendar and in his other poetry he appears more under their influence than Horace or Vergil. More than almost any other writer, he humanizes the celestials (cf. *Fasti* i. 711: Frondibus Actiacis comptos redimita capillos, Pax). And yet he has no mere personification in mind; e. g., *Ars amat.* i. 445, 446:

> Spes tenet in tempus, semel est si credita, longum;
> illa quidem fallax sed tamen apta dea est.

Trist. iii. 1. 71, 72:

> Nec me, quae doctis patuerunt prima libellis,
> atria Libertas tangere passa sua est.

Fast. iv. 6. 23, 24:

> hac [die=April 13] quoque, ni fallor, populo dignissima ratio
> atria Libertas coepit habere sua.

In *Fasti* i. 121 f. he represents Pax dwelling in the temple of Janus, and declares that when to the latter

> libuit Pacem placidis emittere tectis,
> libera per tutas ambulat illa vias.

When describing a procession of gods (*Amor.* iii. 2. 45), he invokes Victoria, who is the first to pass by, to come to his help and make his love victorious. In recalling the courage of Iphias (*Ars amat.* iii. 21 ff.), he remarks:

> ipsa quoque et cultu est et nomine femina Virtus;
> non mirum populo si placet illa suo.

Yet the attempt in two cases to clothe these artificial deities in the garb of vivid personality by the use of mythology makes Ovid inconsistent and illustrates for us the poverty of such material, for the poet makes Iustitia and Spes *each* the last divinity to leave the earth; thus *Fasti* i. 249:

> nondum Iustitiam facinus mortale fugarat,
> ultima de superis illa reliquit humum.

Pontus i. 6. 29: Haec dea [i. e., Spes] . . . . in dis invisa sola remansit humo. While Ovid's works are replete with personification we find few cases of confusion of it with deity; e. g., *Metam.* viii. 776, neque enim Cereremque Famemque fata coire sinunt:

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Amor.. i. 2. 30 ff.; Mens Bona . . . . Pudor . . . . Blanditiae Error Furor.

In prose of this period we have only the history of LIVY, which narrates the foundation of cults, but gives no inkling of the attitude of the author or of anybody else.

C. LITERATURE OF THE FIRST AND SECOND CENTURIES A. D.

In taking up the sources of the first two centuries in our era we may pass over at once the mythological work under the name of HYGINUS; although at the beginning this contains the genealogy of many deified abstracts among other divinities, they are only a compilation from Greek sources, particularly tragedy, and hence valueless for our purpose. VALERIUS MAXIMUS also gives us little aid, on account of the fulsome rhetoric with which he colors his collection of anecdotes. Yet he draws pictures, not only of personification, but of the gods. Note, for example, his description of Tiberius attended on his journey to his sick brother Drusus in Germany by sanctissimum Pietatis numen et di fautores eximiarum virtutum et fidissimus Romam imperi custos, Iuppiter (v. 5. 3); also the picture of Fides in vi. 6. 5 *Ext.* i: crediderim tunc ipsam Fidem humana negotia speculantem maestum gessisse vultum, perseverantissimum sui cultum iniquae fortunae iudicio tam acerbo exitu damnatum cernentem; also vi. 6. 1 and i. 8. 17: societatem . . . . ipsius caelestis Concordiae genitam; vii. 7. 4: si ipsa Aequitas hac de re cognosceret. In the case of Pudicitia (vi. 1) his rhetoric carries him beyond the limits of reality, when he portrays her as a goddess of chastity, honored by both sexes, married and unmarried.

SENECA, as a believer in deism, threw overboard the abstract with the mythological gods. They do not appear at all in his moral essays and epistles. Unfortunately, his essay *De superstitione* has been almost entirely lost, but from the fragment preserved by Augustine (*De civ. dei* vi. 10), in which he characterizes Pavor and Pallor as teterrimos hominum adfectus, quorum alter mentis territae motus est, alter corporis ne morbus quidem sed color (frag. 33, ed. Haase), we may infer that he wrote an extended polemic against the deified appellatives. The line (*Oct.* 911), nullum Pietas nunc numen habet nec sunt superi; regnat mundo tristis Erinys, of course is only dramatic.

The same point of view is taken by PLINY THE ELDER, and discussed quite fully in a passage concerning the futility of inquiring into the form and figure of the divine power. In ii. 7. 14 ff. he says:

> Innumeros quidem credere atque etiam ex vitiis hominum, ut Pudicitiam, Concordiam, Mentem, Spem, Honorem, Clementiam, Fidem, aut (ut Democrito placuit) duos omnino Poenam et Beneficium maiorem ad socordiam accedit. Fragilis et laboriosa mortalitas in partes ista digessit infirmitatis suae memor, ut portionibus coleret quisque quo maxime indigeret.

He comments further on the multitude of such conceptions and the worship of evils, instancing those that Cicero named—a fact that shows the dependence of this passage on Cicero's philosophical works.[32] Fortuna, he says (§22), was a goddess midway between antithetical conceptions, devised by man in order that surmise about deity might be less clear. She is invoked at all hours and places by everybody throughout the world, now in praise, now in censure as the cause of all gain and loss. Mankind is such a slave to the lot that the lot itself stands as a god.

TACITUS reveals no hint of his personal attitude, but the chronicle of events he has left us clearly indicates the tendency of feeling toward these gods throughout the imperial period. The creation of divinities so frequent in the third and second centuries B. C. is revived, and goes to ridiculous extremes when the virtues of the ruling house become the object of flattery. Any mere appellative made prominent by some connection with the emperor or his family was revered and exalted till it becomes extremely difficult to judge whether, even in official circles, it was only praised or really adored. So altars, in the republic a true sign of cult, came to be practically honorary tablets indirectly to flatter the emperor. In the inscriptions those in which the deification was connected with the emperor as the possessor (in the genitive case) constitute the great majority, except in those pertaining to Fortuna and Victoria.

Now, Tacitus shows how the servile Senate manufactured these deifications, setting up altars to Clementia and Amicitia (*Ann.* iv. 74) and voting one for Adoptio (ibid. i. 14). Editors of Tacitus usually imply that no worship was intended for these altars, but

[32] It is a sign of the almost total absence of cults of base qualities in the flourishing period of the Roman state that, after Cicero, no new names are cited as instances. It is probable that the shrines mentioned were founded in the early period when the religion was popular and not official.

that they were commemorative. But certainly worship different in essence from that suggested by these altars was not intended when the temple of Fecunditas was built in 63 A. D. with direct reference to the pregnancy of the empress (*Ann.* xv. 23). The difference is only in degree, and it is more exact, perhaps, to say that in both cases there was formal worship, but it amounted to not much more than commemoration. The proposed altar to Ultio in the temple of Mars Ultor was doubtless intended to receive sacrifices.

SUETONIUS also has an illustrative passage (*Vitell.* 15) on the meaningless treatment of these divinities. When Rome was rent with faction and blood was flowing, the emperor took off his poniard and quasi in aede Concordiae positurus abscessit. Sed quibusdam adclamantibus ipsum esse Concordiam rediit nec solum retinere se ferrum affirmavit verum etiam Concordiae recipere cognomen. Now, these sycophants surely did not consider him the feminine deity Concordia, but the spirit of concord. Neither they nor he would have given him the designation Juno or Minerva.

Turning to poetry, we find little in LUCAN outside of personification, and this statement is also true of the poetical portions of PETRONIUS' *Saturae*. In the latter occurs a striking picture of Pax, Fides, Iustitia, and Concordia (§124, ll. 245, 263, Bücheler), but they are immediately followed by unreal deities like Letum, Insidiae, and Furor. Petronius also fancies a temple of Amor (§127. 3), and frequently mentions Fortuna.

SILIUS ITALICUS was given to excessive rhetoric, and personification is worn to death in the *Bellum Punicum*. Mors, Luctus, Planctus, Maeror, Dolor, Metus, Terror, and Furor, and so on ad infinitum, appear everywhere. Deity and quality are combined in confusion merely for vivid effect; e. g., Virtus and Voluptas (xv. 18), Ebrietas, Luxus, Infamia Honor, Laudes, Gloria Decus ac Victoria (xv. 95 ff.). In the case of Fides, however, whom he treats frequently and at length in books ii and vi, he has deity clearly in mind. Thus he makes Hercules proceed to her temple in heaven and address her thus: ante Iovem generata decus divumque hominumque, Qua sine non tellus pacem, non aequora norunt, Iustitiae consors tacitumque in pectore numen, quem maesta virorum ora vocant, etc. (ii. 475 ff.), the longest passage concerning any of the deified virtues in Latin literature.

STATIUS is still more prolific in figments of the brain, but he also has a few references to our deities, e. g., *Silv.* iii. 3. 1.

> Summa deum Pietas, cuius gratissima caelo
> rara profanatas inspectant numina terras
> huc vittata comam niveoque insignis amictu . . . . .

He styles Virtus "gory" (cruenta, *Silv.* i. 6. 62), Fides alma (*Theb.* xi. 98). With him, as with Silius, Concordia is specialized to married life (ibid. i. 240). He also deifies Annona (ibid. i. 6. 38).

The satires of JUVENAL contain a few allusions, e. g., i. 114:

> . . . . nullas nummorum ereximus aras
> ut colitur Pax atque Fides Victoria Virtus
> quaeque salutato crepitat Concordia nido . . . .

in which the contrast between a cult of wealth and that of the virtues and utilities shows a respect for the latter. In vi. 307 ff. he severely censures the insult to the statue of Pudicitia by women. On the other hand, he depreciates Fortuna (x. 365 f., quoted by Lactantius iii. 29. 17):

> nullum numen habes, si sit prudentia; nos te
> nos facimus, Fortuna, deam caeloque locamus.

Upon MARTIAL our cults apparently made little impression, for the few allusions are merely rhetorical, e. g., x. 50. 1–4, Victoria, Favor, Honor, and Gloria; iv. 13. 7, Concordia and Venus in metonymy.

Of the other authors in this period we need speak only of Apuleius, Fronto, and Aulus Gellius. The *Metamorphoses* of APULEIUS are replete with personification and deification, but since the tales are essentially Greek, we learn little regarding Roman practice.[33] Probable references to Roman deities, however, are found in vi. 15: nec Providentiae bonae graves oculos innocentis animae latuit aerumna; ii. 21: ut ipsos etiam oculos Solis et Iustitiae frustrentur, cf. iii. 7, iii. 26: sed pro Iuppiter hospitalis et Fidei secreta numina; xi. 28: quidni spiritu faventis Eventus. Doubtful is xi. 10, Aequitatis indicium; but as the priests of Isis are represented bearing the symbols of certain gods (potentissimorum deum praeferebant insignis exuvias, quorum primus lucernam . . . . secundus altaria . . . . deae, ibat tertius . . . . Mercuriale caduceum, quartus Aequitatis indicium, deformatam manum

[33] The mock-serious worship of Risus, so frequently referred to in ii. 31; iii.10, and elsewhere, was an actual Greek cult, Γέλως, in Thessaly and Sparta. Cf. Plut. *Cleon.* 9; *Lycurgus* 25.

sinistram porrecta palmula), the goddess may have been intended. Besides these, Victoria and Fortuna, with their conventional epithets, are often mentioned (e. g., vii. 2; vi. 28; ii. 4), and with the latter goddess it is interesting to observe a conception common in the inscriptions: ii. 20, per Fortunas (vestras) vestrosque Genios—as if the fortunes of a man were comparable to presiding spirits.

From the letters of FRONTO we have a single passage of interest. In expressing his preference for the spontaneous affection of Marcus Aurelius and his dislike of esteem that is won by skilful obsequiousness, he is drawn into a comparison between fortuna and ratio, in which he sees the great superiority of the former, viz.:

> Quis ignorat rationem humani consili vocabulum esse, Fortunam autem deam dearumque praecipuarum? templa fana delubra passim Fortunae dicata: rationi nec simulacrum nec aram usquam consecratam (p. 8 ed. Naber; cf. p. 157).

AULUS GELLIUS declares that the Romans worshiped Fides above all the other virtues (xx. 1. 39). He also describes the appearance of Iustitia, according to Chrysippus, the Stoic, in art and oratory as follows: forma atque filo virginali aspectu vementi et formidabili, luminibus oculorum acribus, neque humilis neque atrocis sed reverendae cuiusdam tristitiae dignitate But his most important note is that which gives a list of gods in libris sacerdotum populi Romani et in antiquis orationibus, showing how certain qualities inherent in the gods are themselves deified and considered the companions of these gods; e. g., Salacia Neptuni, Virites Quirini, Moles Mortis. (See above, p. 54.)

D. LITERATURE OF THE LATE EMPIRE

After Gellius we rarely meet with any references to our subject until the fourth and fifth centuries, and here almost no attention to them is given save as mere personifications. Occasionally we find allusions to a cult showing that it still existed; e. g., Flav. Vopisc. xxviii. 12. 7, Concordia et Romana Victoria; Amm. Marc. xxix. 6. 19, concerning the temple of Bonus Eventus in the Campus Martius.

Victoria plays a prominent rôle in SYMMACHUS and contemporary writers, but not so much with regard to her cult as to the burning question whether her statue, representing the pagan religion, should remain in the senate house. The early Christian emperors

had allowed the worship of the abstracts, while they repressed that of the anthropomorphic deities, because they felt that such worship amounted to little else than the commemoration and veneration of qualities which they themselves revered as characteristics of the one God. Their chief struggle was against gods with barbarous mythological association, which squarely opposed Christianity; not against mere shadowy notions symbolized in plastic art and literary image. Accordingly, until Theodosius officially, and probably after him unofficially, statues were permitted to stand, and the emperors allowed their courtiers to address them by these abstract terms. (Cf. Amm. Marc. xxviii. 6. 7.) And this is the ground that Symmachus was forced to take in pleading for the retention of the statue of Victoria. His words sound as if pleading for a figure of Justice on a county courthouse; e. g. (x. 3. 3): quis ita familiaris est barbaris ut aram Victoriae non requirat . . . . reddatur saltem nomini honor, qui numini denegatus est . . . . cunctis potentia ista votiva: nemo colendam neget, quam profitetur optandam. But the very ardor of his eloquence betrayed the fact that he was pleading, not for a mere *nomen,* but for a *numen* which, masked, disguised, and accorded official sanction, would represent to the people the old religion and be a power for its preservation and future restoration. Ambrosius, however, foiled this scheme, and Victoria was doomed.

Both pagan and Christian writers of this period employ the word deus or dea with some freedom, but only in a perfunctory way, very much as the adjective divinus, applied to something rare or beyond the control of man. This was, of course, the same function that the word had commonly as used by the pagan poets throughout Latin literature, and the Christian poet had no hesitation in following rhetorical custom; e. g., Ausonius iv. 4. 24, Fortis deae.

Of the authors of this period CLAUDIANUS alone deserves mention in our field. While he personified freely and is rhetorical throughout, yet in a few passages he seems to feel the genuine reality of our deities, as e. g., in his exaltation of Clementia (xxii. 6. 11; xvii. 166 ff.) and Victoria (xxviii. 597; xxiv. 204). Besides the usual deifications, he personifies Prudentia, Temperies, Constantia, Patientia, Audacia, Voluptas, Formido, and others.

Here we may briefly mention the grammarians and antiquarians, who, as a rule, afford little assistance toward a realization of actual cults, because they only compile the statements of previous authors

without discrimination. In this way AUSONIUS fell into a ludicrous mistake, when in his list of some actual deities (xi. 8) he included Fas and Vis (see above, p. 56), making deities out of common nouns. In the list of months he ascribes a possible origin of the name Iunius from Iuventa. MACROBIUS hands down the interesting theory that the gods are various names for the sun and its powers, citing Iustitia and Nemesis among them. He also names Vitula a deity of exultation on the authority of Hyllus = Hyginus (supra), and collects the numerous cognomina of Salus—Semonia, Seia, Segetia, Tutilina. SERVIUS (*Ad. Aen.* iii. 607) has the interesting observation that the philosophers (physici) say that different members of the body were consecrated to various deities: aurem Memoriae, fontem Genio, dextram Fidei, genua Misericordiae (cf. *Mythog. Vaticani* II. 23 f., Bode); but this is doubtless Greek in origin. The other grammarians have been cited as occasion arose in discussing the various gods in Part I.

E. THE CHRISTIAN FATHERS

In their attack upon the old Roman religion the early Christian writers, Minucius Felix, Tertullian, Arnobius, Lactantius, Jerome, Augustine, and Paulinus, selected the deified abstractions for attack as one of the weak points in the system. All urge the charge that was brought out by Cotta in Cicero's *De natura deorum,* viz., that these were mental notions without substance or life, masquerading as divine personalities. ARNOBIUS succinctly puts the matter thus (iv. 2):

> nihil horum sentimus et cernimus habere vim numinis neque in aliqua contineri sui generis forma sed esse virtutem viri, salutem salvi, honorem honorati, victoris victoriam, concordis concordiam, pietatem pii, memoriam memoris, feliciter vero viventis ac sine ullis offensionibus felicitatem.

LACTANTIUS (*Inst.* i. 20. 18) adds: non enim per se parietes aut aediculas luto factas sed intra pectus collocandae sunt. PAULINUS NOLANUS (*Epist.* xvi. c. 4) calls them cassa nomina, as foolishly endowed with divine honor as they were invented. But AUGUSTINE was the first to analyze and satirize thoroughly their inconsistencies and imperfections by showing, first, that such deifications were not mutually exclusive; e. g., Fortuna and Felicitas (*De civ. dei* iv. 18; there was really no place for Jupiter with Victoria a goddess, iv. 14); secondly, that they rested upon chance

and the impulse of individuals, and hence were arbitrary creations, whereas many concepts not canonized—e. g., regnum, temperantia, fortitudo, and Quies (the latter only a popular cult)—were as worthy of public worship as Victoria or Virtus (iv. 14, 16, 20); and, lastly, that evils like Febris should no more be considered gods than should discordia (iii. 25).

From this view of the direct statements of serious discussions and the indirect evidence of other literature it is clear that the scholarly and literary Romans felt strongly the difference between the deified abstracts and the other gods. They were to them, with certain exceptions, transparent projections of mental concepts without saga or personality, and were excluded from the rank of the chief gods, since their presence and potency were not so strongly felt. Their sex, which was in reality no more than the grammatical gender of their names, was often forgotten, and they were degraded to serve in literature as mere personifications, with other personifications that were never made gods, from which character it is always difficult to distinguish them.

III. THE ABSTRACTS IN THE INSCRIPTIONS

In the sacred inscriptions we find quite different and often surer evidence than in literature. They reveal to us the attitude, not of the scholars and poets, but of all classes; and the altars, shrines, and temples with which they are connected, the use of the term sacrum and other formulae, the records of sacrifices and feasts, of priests and guilds, are quite as positive evidence as the statements of the investigators, and more credible than a poetic allusion. To set up an altar to a deity required and expressed far greater conviction of the potency of that deity than to inscribe its name on a roll of papyrus.

How, then, did the Romans popularly look upon our divinities, according to the test of their inscriptions? Did they treat them in the same fashion as the major gods, or were they skeptical of their existence as personalities?

The testimony of the stones does not all point in the same direction, nor is it the same for all the fifty or more abstractions commemorated. Moreover, many of the legends are ambiguous because of their brevity. Not infrequently, too, an abstract noun may be interpreted as an appellative or a deification, as was the case so often in literature. This ebb-and-flow between literal meaning and

personification, this Dr.-Jekyll-and-Mr.-Hyde existence of our deities, is apparent even on a superficial examination of the monuments, and is easily detected sometimes in one and the same inscription.

Let us look first at those showing personality, which make up about one-third of the several hundred examples which I have noted. We must, of course, exclude from the number those showing the name only of a deity—e. g., Concordiae sacrum; for only the author of such a reading could tell whether the personality of the goddess or the idea of harmony was uppermost in his mind. It may be objected that this is true of all the gods; that the anthropomorphic as well as the transparent represented concepts expressed in their names which were the real object of prayer and worship by their devotees. But this is not quite true. Originally Jupiter, Neptune, Mercury, and the other major deities were, of course, derived from pure appellatives; but not only had these names shifted so widely from their original roots that their derivation was a source of speculation even to the learned,[34] but they had taken on human forms, attributes, powers, and failings because of the influence of the imaginative literature and plastic art of Greece.

And when these sacred names were used to stand for common objects, the user was plainly conscious of the metonymy. If "sub Iove" meant "under the clear sky" to the ordinary Roman, he probably had an image of the heaven-dwelling lord without any sense of derivation. So, too, when Terence says (*Eun.* 732), "sine Cerere et Libero friget Venus," these deities do not lose their personality by the metonymy. The fact that the phrase was a proverb is sufficient proof (Cic. ibid. ii. 60). But the deities we are concerned with never lost their transparent meaning and whether they took on personality to any extent or not is the object of our present investigation.

The signs of personality are, in general, vocative, epithets and adjectives applicable to a human being, like optimus, stator, conservator, regina, which are applied to Jupiter and Juno. The deities Bonus Eventus, Concordia, Fides, Fortuna, Pax, Pietas, Salus, Spes, Tutela, Valetudo, Victoria, and Virtus have such designations, and of them Fortuna, Victoria, Salus, and Virtus far more commonly

[34] Cf. Cicero *De nat. deor.* iii. 62. In enodandis autem nominibus, quod miserandum sit, laboratis. Saturnus, quia se saturat omnis, Mavors, quia magna vertit, Minerva quia minuit aut quia minatur, Venus, quia venit ad omnia, Ceres a gerendo. Quam periculosa consuetudo! In multis enim nominibus haerebitis.

than the others, as was to be expected. Fortuna, indeed, seems almost as anthropomorphic as any of the "twelve gods." F. Primigenia is styled Iovis puer(=puella) (*CIL.* XIV, 2862, 2863), and once is addressed as follows:

> Tu, quae Tarpeio coleris vicina Tonanti,
> Votorum vindex semper Fortuna meorum,
> Accipe....

She is commonly called Redux, Obsequens, Respiciens, and Regina. (Cf. also Carter *De cogn. deor.*, p. 61, and *Trans. Amer. Phil. Asso.* 1900, p. 60.)

Victoria is called Virgo (*L'ann. épig.* 1898, no. 14), Regina (XIII. 4290), Comes Virtutis (VIII. 18240), dominorum (*Notizie* 1891, p. 251), and Sancta (III. 7687). Twice she is tautologically styled Victrix (VIII. 9017; VII. 111), as if her personality had so overshadowed the meaning of her name that it became unimpressive and the adjective was ascribed to her as it was to Venus. Salus is invoked directly and in the same manner as Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva in the prayers of the Arval Brothers for the safety of the emperor, and Virtus was often called by the soldiers their "dea sancta" (VIII. 9026, 9027; XIII. 6385). One inscription from Africa (*L'ann. épig.* 1898, no. 61) reads: Deae pedisequae Virtutis Bellonae lecticam cum suis ornamentis et basem C. Avianius Amandus augur d(onum) d(edit) et consecravit. The others named above are vividly personified once or twice, as follows:

(Wilmanns *Exempla* 150) Concordia Sospes.
(II. 2412) deo sancto Evento.
(IX. 60) Alma Fides tibi ago grates, sanctissima diva.
(VI. 17130) Sed te nunc, Pietas, venerorque precorque
Ut bene pro meriteis hilares Hilaram.
in which latter case the word hilares is strikingly human.
(VII. 100) Salus Regina.
(XI. 4188, 6433) Spes et Fortuna valete.
(XIII. 411, VI. 30984) Tutelae sanctissimae, Tutelae optimae.
(VII. 20747) Bonae Valetudini sanct(ae).

But by far the great majority of the inscriptions show that mere quality was the predominant element in the author's conception. The indications of this are, first, impersonal adjectives and epithets; second, genitives and modifying phrases. The common epithet perpetua applied to Concordia, Pax, and Salus (VIII. 15447; II. 3349; X. 4170a) is rarely used of a person, though Martial (vi.

64. 10) writes perpetui scrinia Silii; and publica, salutaris, casualis, militaris, used of Felicitas, Fortuna, Fides, and Disciplina, are likewise usually impersonal (II. 4497; III. 1010; III. 3315; VIII. 9832, 10657; *Eph. Epig.* III. 580; on the other hand, note Iovi salutari, Trebellius Pollio, xxiii. 5. 5). All these are the regular terms applied to the abstracts in inscriptions, and are in great contrast with the very human names attached to the other gods, as pater, mater, invictus, felix, vilicus, and others. "Iupiter publicus" would be an anomaly.

In the case of adjectves applicable both to persons and qualities, the personal force is not usually felt when they are attached to the abstracts. Fortuna, dea bona, is, of course, personal, but Bona Fortuna, Bonus Eventus, Bona Mens, Bona Valetudo, are not the good deities, Fortuna, Eventus, Mens, Valetudo, but the good kind of "fortune," "outcome," and so forth; they are restrictive, not descriptive, and the adjective is in reality an integral part of the name, as indeed it actually is written in [Bo]nevento [profec]tionis (IX. 1560). The extent to which such restrictive adjectives were employed is illustrated by the worship of Fortuna Melior at Spoletium, Antium, and Interamna (XIV. 216).

But by far the greatest number of dedications which show weak personifications are those wherein genitives or modifying phrases are attached to the deity's name. They consist of the names of towns and townspeople, e. g.: (X. 7192) Concordiae Agrigentinorum; of guilds, (V. 7555) Concordiae collegii, (V. 4203) Bonum Eventum VI vir(um) sociorum; of soldiers, (XIII. 6670; III. 5123); of places of business or public buildings, (XI. 3075); of the gods, (VI[1], pp. 561); of the empire, the emperors, the Senate, and private individuals.

Now, such modifiers are not characteristic of, but alien to, the anthropomorphic gods. There is no Iuppiter imperi, no Mars militum, no Neptunus classis. The exceptions to this rule are very few. The most noteworthy is the phrase Iuno cuiusdam mulieris; but although derived from the goddess' function as a guardian of marriage and the female sex, the name Juno in this use came to stand for an entity quite distinct from the celestial wife of Jupiter. A stone from Pannonia (III. 3305) bears the dedication: Herculi Augusti M. Domiti Secundinus.[35]

[35] This inscription so far as I can ascertain, has not been quoted on the question whether Hercules was anciently a form of Genius. It may have been a

Another stone reads deae Dianae Augustorum (XIII. 1495), but here Augustorum depends upon dea, whose thought is carried over the appositive, or there is a confusion of two constructions. In Mauretania the dedication Dianae Aug. Maurorum (VIII. 8436) seems parallel to the examples cited of the abstracts. However, the word dea or some appositive, e. g., tutatrix, is to be understood without doubt, and a similar substitution seems at first sight a plausible solution also for the cases mentioned above. Concordia Visentium (II. 465) would then be Concordia Visentium dea. But the explanation calls forth several objections. First, the use of dea or a similar noun in apposition with an abstract modified by a genitive is comparatively rare; second, the use of a possessive adjective equivalent to a genitive as in Fidei suae sacrum (X. 5903) could not be explained easily by that substitution; finally, the frequency of such modifying genitives and the close connection they form with the deified abstracts amount almost to a demonstration that an appositive was not only not understood, but was superfluous. It would be almost impossible to supply any substantive in Prosperitati deorum (III. 4557) and Providentiae deorum (VI[1], p. 560). Concordiae Agrigentinorum sacrum (X. 7192) meant "sacred to the concord of the Agrigentines," not to Concord their goddess; Felicitati imperi meant "to the happiness of the Empire;" Saluti generis humani (XIII. 1589), "to the welfare of the human race;" Fidei populi Romani (X. 769), "to the public good faith of the Roman people;" and so on.

The genitives thus used may belong to different grammatical categories. Disciplinae Augusti (VII. 896) is of course subjective, as is Pietati cuiusdam (XI. 4772; VI. 28549); Tutelae horreorum (II. 2991) is more probably objective; Honori stat(ionis) (III. 5123) may be either objective or possessive; Providentiae deorum (VI[1], p. 560) can be subjective only, but Providentiae Imperatoris (cf. XI. 4170; X. 6310) may be either subjective or objective,

copyist's mistake. The restoration of III. 5531 given in the index of the *Corpus* as Herculi Aug(usti) n(ostri) is uncertain. It may be Herculi Aug(usto) n(ostro). The indices of the *Corpus* show an astonishing inconsistency in the filling-out of the abbreviation Aug. Not only so, but it is even filled out without indication that it was abbreviated on the stone. From the frequency of the genitive on coin-legends and the several cases in the inscriptions, it is by no means certain that Aug.=Augustus or Augusti, but this question should be left unprejudiced by the index of the *Corpus*.

according to whether we understand the emperor's foresight or the providence of the gods over him. In short, these deified appellatives thus modified behave precisely as do their less fortunate brethren and sisters who were not canonized.

It may be said that the anthropomorphic gods also are restricted in extent and meaning, and that therefore no real difference exists between them and the abstractions. Cognomina, it is true, are given to all the gods to locate them in various places with their special cults, and so we have Iupiter Anxurus, Damascenus, Heliopolitanus, Dolichenus, Mars Buxenus, Rudianus, Ceres Antiatina, Venus Erycina, and others. Nevertheless, their personality is not diminished, for the cognomina of nationality are applicable to persons. Jupiter is the Heliopolitan, one of the Heliopolitans. Venus is one of the Erycini, just as Italian localities have their special Madonnas: e. g., Santa Maria di Leuca, di Luco, Madonna di Camorana, di Laccargia. Cf. Notre Dame de Lourdes. But very rarely is a genitive of place attached to the name of a god or a singular subjective or possessive genitive like Concordiae ipsius (*Acta Arval,* VI[1], p. 482, l. 17). Indeed, so rare is it, that an apparent example, viz., Marti suo Valeri v. s. l. m. (XII. 2986), evoked a note from Hirschfeld ad locum. This tendency to use depersonifying modifiers (to coin a word) cannot be attributed to the looseness of conception of imperial times, when qualities were regularly manufactured into deities; for we find the ancient names Fides publica populi Romani, Fortuna huiusce diei (Cic. *De legg.* ii. 28: *Fast. Allif. CIL.* I[2], p. 323; cf. Wissowa *R.-K.,* p. 211).

In the examples thus far treated either the element of personality or that of quality was pre-eminent. A few occur also in which both elements are seen, as they are in Horace (*Carm.* i. 35. 21; cf. supra, p. 77). We read of statues being erected not of a wide ruling deity, but of a deified quality of some particular person or persons—statues, for example, of Concordia decurionum (II. 3424), Bonus Eventus equitum leg(ionis) xxii (XIII. 6669), Felicitas Aeclani (IX. 1154), Libertas Restituta (VI. 471), Indulgentia domini nostri (VIII. 7095), Securitas saeculi (ibid.). It is difficult to say in many cases whether Pietas is goddess or virtue, for the word became specialized to the sphere of death and the burial of the dead (cf. Italian pietá), and burial-guilds were sometimes called collegia pietatis, e. g., XII. *add. ad. no.* 286: D. M. conlig(ium) (*sic*)

pietatis Festina Iuliaes Restitutae ancilla ex pecuni que (*sic*) funere sui f.; also IX. *add.* 1930, p. 671:

Pietas Martensum
Hispaniae Pompiniae
D. f. v. an. XXVII m. X. d. XV M.
coniugi incomparabili
Pontius Priscus meritus
b. m. f.

Often in sepulchral inscriptions the phrase pro pietate occurs, which is sometimes varied by the dative pietati; e. g., VI. 28549; cf. Zangemeister, note to XIII. 1167. It is difficult in such cases to distinguish between deity and quality, for even in an epitaph the deity may be mentioned; e. g., Orelli 4577; cf. *CIL.* XIV. 1792: D. M. s. M. Veti Decembris filii piissimi reliquae annorum XVIII consecratae Pietati et Genio inferno ab M. Vetio Trophimo et Vetia Lupula parentibus. Therefore, in XIII. 1167 mentioned above, Lepida Valentis f. Regini uxor Lepida Regini fil. Pietati, we cannot be certain with Zangemeister that the goddess was not meant.[36]

The legend Securitati sacrum suggests a general conception of divinity, but its position at the beginning of epitaphs (VI. 28047, 9016, 25607) restricts it to the state of safety which the dedicators wished for the dead. Sanctitati Iovis et Augusti sacrum (XII. 2981) is abstract noun used for concrete adjective, but it is possible that in the phrase sacrum dis magnis maioribus et sanctissimae Sanctitati the last word may represent an actual deity in the dedicator's mind.

Confused conceptions are apparent also when a quality is in collocation with a real god; e. g. (VII. 220), deo Marti et Victoriae p(opuli) R(omani), where the worshiper is thinking of Victoria and of the victory of the Romans over their foes. In the following (XI. 4770), Iovi O. M. Fortunaeque Maeliori (*sic*) Aug. et dis daeabus (*sic*) quae, the author conceived of Fortuna Melior, but his idea must have been as loose as his spelling. In a prayer of the Arvals (VI[1], p. 476) we read: O Salus publica populi Romani Quiritium te quaesumus precamurque ut tu Neronem Claudium . . . . conserves. This immediately follows prayers to Jupiter,

[36] From the portrait lying above this inscription of a woman with a little child it does not follow that reference to the deity is excluded. The husband who set up the stone may have intended by a dedication to Pietas to show his own pietas.

Juno, and Minerva—an excellent illustration of the combination of personality and literal content.

Many other abstracts are found in juxtaposition with the greater gods, and the frequency of these combinations is to a certain degree a test of their realism. Fortuna is found in the company of nearly all the deities, but most frequently with Hercules in the inscriptions of the equites singulares and close to the Capitoline trinity, in one case even preceding Minerva (XIII. 6728). Victoria and Felicitas follow Mars and Mercury in the military inscriptions; e. g., (VI. 31140): Iovi O. M., Iunoni, Minervae, Marti, Victoriae, Herculi, Fortunae, Mercurio, Felicitati . . . . ; cf. VI. 31138–87.[37]

Whenever any considerable number of the gods is mentioned, Felicitas and Salus are included, and in the prayers of the Arval Brothers they are invoked in close connection with Mars and Hercules. The phrase Martis et Pacis Lari (Wilmanns op. cit. 150) shows a closeness of connection and personality not elsewhere paralleled. The meaning of this latter combination is, of course, transparent, as it is in XIII. 6621, Iovi O. M., Apollini, Aesculapio, Saluti, Fortunae, in which we have a good example of the successive narrowing of conceptions.

But generally the abstracts are associated together, and they often have the same seat of worship, whereas the combination in one cult of a personal and an abstract deity is surely attested in only one case—viz., Mars and Victoria (III. 14370[9].)—besides the famous cult of Aesculapius and Salus. So, besides the cult of Honor and Virtus at Rome, the following pairs were enshrined together in temples or chapels or had one priest or were in some special manner associated:

. . . . aedem Fortunae et Victoriae.—Ficulea (XIV. 4002).
. . . . sacerdoti Spei et Salutis Aug.—Gabii (XIV. 2804).

As the priestess of this cult gave largesses and games pro salute Antonini, it was probably very prominent and under the patronage of the imperial house, for the deity Spes had special reference to the sons of the emperor, the "hope" of his house. Cf. *Fast. Cum.*, l. 5; *CIL.* I, p. 310: Caesar togam virilem sumpsit: supplicatio Spei et Iuve(ntati.)

[37] For Mars and Victoria see also III. 1098, 5790, 5897, 5898; VII. 220; XIII. 6593. They had a temple together in Raetia (III. 14370).

[h]eisce mag(istrei) Spei Fidei Fortunae murum faciundum coiravere M. Minucio L. Postumio cos.—10 B. C.; Capua (X. 3775).

If not in one temple, these goddesses were evidently closely associated in worship.

Fortunae et Tutelae huius loci P. Aelius. . . . . p. p. aedem cum porticu a solo restituit (VI. 177).

The fortune and protection of a place are kindred ideas and commonly united. Cf. VI. 179, 216; *CIRh.* 628.

flamini Victoriae et Felic(itatis) Caesar(is?) perpetuo (XI. 4371).
sacerdoti Victoriae Felicitat(is) (XI. 4367).
curatori lusus iuvenum V(ictoriae) F(elicitatis) C(aesaris?) (XI. 4395).
. . . . Vic(toriae) Felic(itatis) (XI. 4373).

This cult from Ameria in Umbria is perhaps the most important double cult outside of Rome of which we have evidence, and it was without doubt the most prominent worship in Ameria, for its officers were men who held the highest political, military, and social rank, embracing quattuorviri iure dicundo, aediles, praefecti cohortium, pontifices, seviri Augustales. The cult had special exhibitions celebrated by the iuvenes in honor of the Caesar (or Caesars?). So well known was it, that three of the four inscriptions cited abbreviate the name by omitting the connective and shortening the names, in one case even to the initial letters.

We may also see the lack of strong individuality in the use of the abstracts as cognomina of other gods, for in proportion as they become mere qualities transparent in their name they lose their identity and are attached to other more clearly recognized deities, to whom their qualities are suited. This tendency toward amalgamation is the opposite of that by which one deity springs from another, for this latter process starts with a given deity worshiped in a special phase denoted by an adjective, which as a token of differentiation from other phases becomes important, and so overshadows the name of the god to whom it is applied as to become independent, and finally to be supplanted by a noun of similar meaning. The tendency toward amalgamation, on the contrary, starts with two independent ideas, related in general meaning, which are fused to cover completely a given concept, the less important of the two ideas becoming subordinate and expressed as a cognomen of virtually adjective force. One deity is considered merely as an aspect of another.

Such assimilation is seen in its extreme form in the common representation of Fortuna with the attributes of many other gods; also in the Stoic belief that all the deities were phases of the universe (mundus) which Varro represented by Jupiter. This fusion is a step farther on than the combination of which we have just spoken. It is the identification of one god as part or function of another; cf. Phoebus Apollo in Greek. But, unfortunately, in the inscriptions, which are our chief and almost only source of information in this matter, it is a perplexing task to distinguish between combination and fusion, because of the inconsistent and almost haphazard use of the connective et. With combinations of three or more names without the connective there is no doubt that distinct deities are intended, but in the case of two it becomes a problem into which many elements enter. Some inscriptions affect brachylogy and asyndeton, like Cato's *De re rustica.* Others employ it to save space, and in a votive inscription, where no more than one divinity can be named on a line, the copula is often omitted, apparently to keep the symmetry of the lines. A priori one would expect et between any two co-ordinate words, but it is omitted in a considerable number of cases; e. g.: (III. 3158) I. O. M. | Fort. Reduci; (III. 5938) deo Mercu|rio Fortunae Reduci; (VII. 1111) I. O. M.| Victoriae | Victrici|; (VIII. 6951) Honoris Virtutis Aug. sacr; (XIV. 2856) : Pietati | Fort. Primig. (XI. 4367, 4373, 4395). Victoriae Felicitatis. In these cases the space was not small, and no reason appears for the asyndeton; but in all of them there is no doubt that two deities were intended, and they must show the possibility of supplying a connective in other cases not so certain. However, they do not constitute a large percentage, for while the examples touching all the gods have not been examined for this purpose, yet in the field of abstracts, out of ninety inscriptions, only fifteen showed asyndeton. We are warranted, therefore, in assuming great probability of the use of a cognomen when the connective is lacking; but each case should be weighed by itself. For even in the well-known cults of Jupiter Iuventas and Jupiter Libertas, generally taken by scholars as single cults with cognomina, there can be reasonable doubt, since it has been seen above how Victoria et Felicitas (XI. 4371) was shortened to Victoria Felicitas even in official designation. Cf. also Honoris Virtutis Aug. . . . . The same thing is possible of Iupiter Libertas, and the two inscriptions outside Rome cited by Aust (Roscher s. v. Iupiter) and Wissowa (*R.-K.*, p. 106,

n. 2) to corroborate the designation in the *Monumentum Ancyranum* prove only that there were similar cults in those places. They may easily have been taken directly from the Roman abbreviated title.[38]

Despite this uncertainty, however, I venture to give a list of the fairly certain, probable, and doubtful cognomina. An inspection of the stone would perhaps lead one to different conclusions in many cases, so that this list is mainly for the sake of reference.

The following seem to me fairly certain:

. . . . basim posuit deae Florae Fortunae Pentheae (VI. 30867).

Both the singular deae and basim indicate one goddess. Pantheae is a regular cognomen of Fortuna (Roscher I, p. 1538).

Iovi Iuventuti (IX. 5574; XI. 3245).

Iovi Libertati (*Mon. Ancyr.* IV. 6; *CIL.* XIV. 2579; XI. 658).

deae Dianae Nemesi Aug. (III. 10440).

Cf. III. 4738, where Nemesis is represented with the attributes of Diana. On the other hand, Nemesi Reginae et Deanae (III. 10476).

Pantheo Tutelae (II. 4055).

Hübner ad loc. says asyndeton was not the custom of the period of this inscription, the reign of the Antonines.

deae Virtuti Bellonae (V. 6507).

Cf. XIII. 7281; Wissowa *R.-K.*, p. 292, n. 3. The abstract Virtus is here more important than Bellona.

Fort(unae) Felicit(ati) (XIV. 2568).

One goddess is represented in the accompanying bas-relief.

deae Fortunae Tutelae (VI. 178).

Iustitiae Nemes(i) (X. 3812).

The bilingual form δεσποίνῃ Νέμεσι shows that but one deity was meant.

Less certain are:

Iunoni Nemesi (III. 11121). Nemesi in smaller letters.

Iunoni Concordiae Aug. (VIII. 4197). Large space between the two names.

Mercurio Aequitati Aug. (*L'ann. épig.* 1904, no. 119).

The following are doubtful:

Iovis Tutelae C. Hostilius Aemilianus ve(teranus) Aug(ustorum) n(ostrorum) v. s. l. m. (V. 4243).

Possibly the order makes for the construction of Tutelae as a genitive in apposition with Iovis, according to Aust's view (Roscher II, p. 752), but the use of a genitive standing alone without its governing word, and the fact

[38] The Greek translation Ζεὺς Ἐλευθέριος in *Mon. Ancyr.* may have arisen from a misunderstanding of the Latin copy.

that one expects an indirect object after votum solvit make the dative seem preferable. In that case Iovis is subjective genitive. (So Carter *De cogn.*, p. 58.)

I. O. M. Advento et pro salute . . . . (III. 6340).

Mutilated and uncertain; perhaps advento=pro adventu.

Concordiae Augustae Pietati (X. 810).

The brachylogy of the rest of the inscription suggests et here, but, as one building is referred to, it may mean a single cult.

Menti Bonae Saluti (XIV. 3564).

The above evidence is sufficient to show the anomalous position of these deified abstractions in popular thought. Elevated to the rank of divinity and provided with temples, flamens, priests, altars, and all the wherewithal of a real cult, they are nevertheless practically mere qualities or states restricted to this, that, and the other, a non-descript and shadowy crowd that cannot be classified with the anthropomorphic gods nor the materialistic spirits of the Indigitamenta.

Nevertheless, they serve a purpose and perform a function very similar, and indeed in some cases exactly equivalent, to a god whom the Romans worshiped in a highly personal way. It has been noticed long before this that these deities have marked resemblances to the genii. (Cf. Boissieü *Inscriptions de Lyon*, p. 12; Preller II, p. 178. The latter discusses them in the same chapter with the genii and Indigitamenta.) I wish here, therefore, only to point out that this is the conception of them seen most commonly in the inscriptions. The combination of an abstraction with a genius is far and away the most frequent; the same kind of genitives and the same possessive adjectives are attached to both; e. g.: (XIII. 6127) Genio b(ene)f(iciariorum) (et) Concordi(ae) var(iarum) stat(ionum); (VI. 32352) Saluti eius b. m. et Genio ipsius; (XIII. 6690) Genium legioni (*sic*) XXII. Pr. p. f. Honori Aquilae. Finally, not only the same kind, but the very same genitives in numerous instances modify Genius and an abstract; e. g.: (XII. 1815) Genio et Honori utriculariorum (cf. V. 4449; XIII. 6690); (Orelli 1718; III. 449; VI. 254) Genio ac maiestati Imp. Antonini Pii Felicis Augusti; (II. 4082) Laribus et Tutelae Genio L(uci) n(ostri); (VI. 216; cf. 177–79) Genio et Fortunae Tutelaeque huius loci. In the last case the genitive is felt with each noun. One or two cases occur where an abstract is pluralized; e. g.: (VI. 182) Fortunab(us) bal(nei) Verul(ani) C. Hostilius Agathopus d(onum) d(edit); (VIII.

20827; cf. VIII. 15259–516) I. O. P. Max. Geniusque diis immortalibus Victoriisque d(ominorum) n(ostrorum) invictorum. Tutela, as has been noticed before, is a conception that links the abstracts with the genii. On the one side she is viewed as the general deity of protection; on the other, as the protecting spirit of a particular place, practically equivalent to the genius.

These deified qualities, therefore, are comparable to the spirits attending a man through life. But whereas a genius was guardian of a wide range of interests, usually material, pertaining to a man or an object, a deified quality protected a special phase of his character or condition, and so in a sense is a specialized genius. Possibly the best example of a mere appellative exalted to an external power or personality presiding over the interests of a person is afforded by the following sepulchral inscription: (XIV. 1792) Iunoni et Verecundiae Ulpiae Compses q(uae) vixit. . . . . Verecundia, not elsewhere deified, is regarded, like a Juno, as the maiden's tutelary spirit. Also in the dedication by a husband and wife to Fides sua (*CIL.* X. 5903) there was a dim conception of a tutelary spirit.

To conclude, it may be said in general that the Romans themselves were not clear in their ideas of this class of deities. Only Fortuna, Victoria, and to a far less extent Salus, Felicitas, and Virtus, had personality in any appreciable degree. The others were mere qualities or conditions worthy of praise, with a thin cloak of deification; and when in this guise they were grouped with the personal gods, they amounted to no more than spirits or genii of those ideas represented in their respective names.

U. C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES
C054579829

RETURN TO the circulation desk of any
University of California Library

or to the
NORTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
Bldg. 400, Richmond Field Station
University of California
Richmond, CA 94804-4698

ALL BOOKS MAY BE RECALLED AFTER 7 DAYS

- 2-month loans may be renewed by calling (510) 642-6753
- 1-year loans may be recharged by bringing books to NRLF
- Renewals and recharges may be made 4 days prior to due date

DUE AS STAMPED BELOW

SEP 26 2003